GENERAL LIBRARY JAN 2 1923

UNIV. OF MICH. JAN 2 1923

VOL. XXI OCTOBER, 1922 No. 4

THE JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

FOUNDED BY GUSTAF E. KARSTEN

MANAGING EDITOR
JULIUS GOEBEL, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
H. S. V. JONES AND G. T. FLOM
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

CO-OPERATING EDITORS
HERMANN COLLITZ, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
GEORGE O. CURME, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
CLARK S. NORTHUP, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE $3.00 A VOLUME; SINGLE NUMBERS $1.00
PUBLISHED QUARTERLY by THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA, ILLINOIS, U. S. A.

THE JOURNAL
OF
ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

(Continuing the Journal of Germanic Philology)

A Quarterly Devoted to the Study and Teaching of the English, German and Scandinavian Languages and Literatures

Open to original communications in the departments of English, German, and Scandinavian philology and literature. All articles for publication should be typewritten. Address

Editor Journal of English and Germanic Philology,
217 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill.

Subscription price $3.00 a volume; individual back volumes, except Vol. 1, the same; Vol. 1 is no longer sold separately.

Special Offer

1. *Complete sets of 20 volumes, $60.00.* There are now 5 complete sets left.

2. Volumes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 *together* for $53.00 instead of $57.00.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	FOR ONE INSERTION.	TWO INSERTIONS.	THREE INSERTIONS.	FOUR INSERTIONS.
1 page..............	$20.00	$35.00	$40.00	$45.00
½ page..............	12.00	20.00	25.00	30.00
¼ page..............	8.00	15.00	20.00	24.00

Address all business communications to

H. E. Cunningham, Director, University of Illinois Press,
161 Administration Building, Urbana, Ill.

BRITISH AGENT:
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, England

CONTINENTAL EUROPEAN AGENT:
ADOLF WEIGEL, Leipzig, Germany

(Entered at Urbana, Illinois, U. S. A., as second-class matter under the Act of Congress of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 31, 1919.) Copyright 1922 by the University of Illinois.

SUNUFATARUNGO

Die Erklärung des merkwürdigen Wortes habe ich vor einer Reihe von Jahren in dem Aufsatze "Zum Hildebrandsliede," in Paul u. Braunes Beiträgen 36 (1910) 367 ff., zu fördern gesucht. Der Vers

Sunufatarungo iro saro rihtun,

so führte ich aus, ist wörtlich zu übersetzen: "Sohn- und Vaterskinder brachten (sie) ihre Rüstung in Ordnung." Neben Hildebrand und seinem Sohne Hadubrand wird ja in dem alten Liede ausdrücklich der Vater Hildebrands, mit Namen Heribrand, erwähnt. Wenn also Sohn und Vater an sich stets auch Söhne oder Nachkommen von Sohn und Vater sind, so brauchen wir in diesem Falle an der Verwendung des patronymischen Suffixes *-ung-* in der feierlich einherschreitenden Zusammensetzung *sunufatarungo* um so weniger Anstoss zu nehmen. Diese Deutung hat sich neuerdings der Zustimmung mehrerer Fachgenossen (vor allem E. v. Steinmeyer, *Die kleineren ahd. Sprachdenkmäler*, Berlin, 1916, S. 13) zu erfreuen gehabt. Ich hätte also kaum Anlass gehabt, an sie zu erinnern, wäre nicht in dem letzten Hefte dieser Zeitschrift (oben S. 153 ff.) eine neue Erklärung der Endung *-ungo* vorgelegt, deren Urheber anscheinend weder mein kleiner Aufsatz noch Steinmeyers musterhaftes und überall förderliches Werk vorgelegen hat. Muss ich ausdrücklich erklären, dass ich an meiner Auffassung noch festhalte? Aber ich benutze diese Gelegenheit gerne, um bei dem in vieler Beziehung lehrreichen Worte *sunufatarungo* noch etwas länger zu verweilen.

Wie man weiss, hat Hermann Möller, *Zur ahd. Alliterationspoesie* (Kiel, 1888) S. 88 f. die Endung *-o* an die idg. Dualendung *-ōu* angeknüpft. Steinmeyer (a. a. O.) S. 14, bemerkt dazu: "Ob ein Dual oder ein Plural vorliegt, weiss ich nicht." Auch ich habe den Eindruck, dass die Gründe für die eine und für die andere Auffassung ziemlich gleich schwer wiegen. Vom Standpunkte der Lautlehre aus ist gegen die Gleichsetzung der Endung *-o* mit aind. *-ā*(u) gewiss nichts einzuwenden, und Möller selbst hat schon auf das parallele Lautverhältnis in ahd. *ahto*, got. *ahtau* und skr. *aṣṭau* hingewiesen. Ebenso erscheint die Annahme durchaus statthaft, eine Dualform habe sich in der Nominalflexion "wenn auch vielleicht bereits als Antiquität oder nur in erstarrten Wörtern" bis auf die Zeit der Abfassung des Hildebrandsliedes erhalten. Als ausgemacht aber könnte Möllers interessante Erklärung nur gelten, wenn es unmöglich wäre, *sunufatarungo* als Nominativ pluralis zu fassen. Letztere Auffassung scheint ja zunächst durch *helidos* (Z. 6) ausgeschlossen. Aber Lachmanns Vorschlag, letzterer Form zuliebe das überlieferte *sunufatarungo* in *sunufatarungos* zu ändern, dürfte heute nur noch wenige Anhänger finden,* zumal Plural-Nominative auf *-o* gerade in den ältesten ahd. Sprachquellen auch sonst begegnen. Eine stattliche Reihe von Beispielen hat namentlich R. Kögel, *Gesch. d. dt. Lit.* 2, 448 gesammelt. Freilich werden derartige Formen von Franck, *Altfränk. Gramm.* S. 174 und Braune, *Ahd. Gramm.*^{3} S. 173 rundweg als Schreibfehler erklärt. Letzterer sagt gradezu: "Eine Nebenform auf *-o* (Kögel, *Lit.* 2, 448) gibt es im Ahd. nicht." Aber Nutzhorn hat sich dadurch in seiner ergebnisreichen Studie über die Murbacher Sprachdenkmäler (Zs. f. dt. Phil. 44, 453) nicht abhalten lassen, dem altelsässischen Dialekte eine Nebenform auf *-o* zuzuschreiben, und, wie mir scheint, mit guten Gründen. Dass in einzelnen Fällen Schreibfehler vorliegen, mag ja sein. Wenn Ahd. Gl. 1, 86, 25 der cod. Pa. als Glosse zu 'servi militum' *scalcho milizzo* aufweist, gegen *scalkha milizzo* in Gl. K., so ist ja möglich oder wahrscheinlich, dass ihm bei *scalcho* die Endung des folgenden Wortes vorschwebte. Aber auch die Möglichkeit ist nicht ganz ausgeschlossen, dass er *scalcho* schon in seiner Vorlage fand und es unter dem Eindrucke von *milizzo* unterliess, die alte Endung in *-a* zu ändern. Dieser Fall steht jedenfalls nicht ganz auf einer Linie mit dem von *sterno* Ahd. Gl. 1, 247, 23, cod. Ra. Das lateinische Lemma ist 'sidera,' und das in den Gl. K. entsprechende *sternon* scheint zu bestäti-

---

*Schwerlich ist Lachmann der Meinung gewesen, das *-s* habe ursprünglich in der Handschrift gestanden und sei nur ganz oder teilweise erloschen. Freilich weist ja die Handschrift zwischen *fatarungo* und *iro* noch einen Punkt auf (vgl. namentlich die photogr. Facsimilia in Koenneckes *Bilderatlas* und bei M. Enneccerus). Aber man darf darin nicht den Überrest eines Buchstabens sehen, sondern es handelt sich um den Trennungspunkt, wie er in der Handschrift vielfach wiederkehrt, um den Abschluss einer Langzeile oder, wie hier, einer Halbzeile zu bezeichnen.

gen, dass hier das *o* dem Original angehört. Nimmt man hinzu, dass das Wort für 'Stern' auch in Pa. und Gl. K. sonst starke Flexion aufweist (*sterna* 'stelle' Pa. und Gl. K. 1, 16, 38; *thero sterno* Gl. K. 1, 17, 39; *st'na* 'stille' Gl. K. 1, 247, 24), so wird man hier, denke ich, dem *sterno* von Ra. mindestens so viel Autorität beimessen, wie dem *sternon* der Gl. K. Schwerer jedoch als derartige Glossen, fallen Formen wie *himilo* in der Isidor-Übersetzung (*himilo endi anghila* 'celi et angeli' 24, 17; vgl. acc. pl. *ahuo ir himilo garauui frumida* 'quando praeparabat celos' (1, 2) und *angilo* der Murbacher Hymnen (acc. pl. *duruh angilo uuntarlihe* 'per angelos mirabiles' 17, 3) ins Gewicht.

Somit bin ich der Meinung, dass *sunufatarungo* zwar von Möller zutreffend als alte Dualform gedeutet ist, aber zur Zeit der Aufzeichnung des Hildebrandsliedes nicht mehr so verstanden wurde. Es blieb als vermeintliche Pluralform unverändert.

Da im Althochdeutschen der Gen. plur. der einzige Kasus der *a*-Deklination ist, welcher regelmässig die Endung *-o* aufweist, so versteht man, wie Jacob Grimm (*Gött. gel. Anz.* 1831, S. 71 = *Kl. Schr.* 5, 23) auf den Gedanken kommen konnte, *sunufatarungo* als Gen. pl. zu fassen und von dem vorhergehenden *heriun tuem* abhängen zu lassen. Diese Auffassung findet ja auch heute noch hier und da einen Verteidiger, darf aber dennoch wohl nach den Einwendungen von Lachmann (*Über d. Hildebrandslied* S. 12 = *Kl. Schr.* 1, 418) und Müllenhoff (Anmerkungen zu den *Denkmälern*^{3} S. 13) als abgetan gelten. Dagegen wird es nicht überflüssig sein, hervorzuheben, dass ein von Lachmann nach dem Vorgange Grimms (*Gramm.* 2, 359) angeführtes Femininum *fædrunga* 'Gevatterin' nicht existiert, also auch auf die Deutung von *sunufatarungo* keinen Einfluss ausüben kann. Allerdings las man im Beowulf, Z. 2128 zu Grimms Zeit *fēondes fædrunga*, und auch noch bei Bosworth-Toller erscheint auf Grund der Beowulfstelle als ἅπαξ λεγόμενον ein schwaches Masculinum *fædrunga* mit der Bedeutung 'a patre cognatus.' Aber man weiss jetzt, dass dieses *fædrunga* nur auf einer Konjektur Thorkelins beruht, und der Vers erscheint in den neueren Ausgaben als

> fēondes fæd(mum un)der firgen-strēam.

Man findet Näheres in den kritischen Anmerkungen der neueren Herausgeber.

Dies führt mich zu einer weiteren Bemerkung über das Patronymsuffix *-ung* und sein Verhältnis zu dem gleichbedeutenden *-ing*. Über beide hat seinerzeit J. Grimm im 2. Bande seiner *Deutschen Gramm.* S. 349 ff. und 359 ff. in gründlicher und vorbildlicher Weise gehandelt, sowohl was die Sammlung des Materials wie das Verständnis desselben anlangt. Den überreichen Stoff vollständig zu buchen oder abschliessend zu verarbeiten, konnte nicht in seiner Absicht liegen. Nach Grimm hat sich K. von Bahder in seiner ausgezeichneten Schrift: *Die Verbalabstracta in den Germanischen Sprachen* (Halle 1880) um die Erklärung der beiden Suffixe am meisten verdient gemacht. Den Endungen *-unga*, *-inga*, an deren Deutung Grimm verzweifelt hatte und deren Zusammenhang mit dem Patronymsuffix bis dahin überhaupt dunkel geblieben war, sind in dieser Schrift volle dreissig Seiten (S. 163-192) gewidmet, und das Rätsel ist, wie ich glaube, glücklich gelöst. Näheres darüber weiter unten. Nur in einer Beziehung scheint mir v. Bahder Grimm gegenüber auf einen Abweg geraten zu sein. Letzterer hatte (*Gramm.* 2, 364) von den Ableitungen mit *ng* im ganzen den Eindruck, es liege darin "ein Begriff der Abstammung oder lieber Verwandtschaft." Diese Definition ist nach v. Bahder zu eng. "Ich glaube," sagt er (S. 168) "dass man von einer viel allgemeineren Bedeutung ausgehen muss, der der Zugehörigkeit." Aus letzterem Begriffe leitet er dann zunächst (S. 169) den der Abstammung oder Verwandtschaft ab. Aber sind damit nicht die Begriffe, vom Standpunkte der geschichtlichen Entwicklung aus angesehen, geradezu auf den Kopf gestellt?

Jedem Suffix, das in lebendigem Gebrauche bleibt und produktiv wirkt, wohnt die Tendenz inne, nicht nur sich innerhalb seiner ursprünglichen Grenzen zu erhalten, sondern darüber hinaus sich auszudehnen. Insbesondere geht bei persönlichen Suffixen die Neigung dahin, sie auf Gegenstände zu übertragen, deren Eigenschaften sich dem Wesen und der Betätigung von Personen vergleichen. Ein nahe liegendes Beispiel gewähren die Nomina agentis auf *-er* im Neuhochdeutschen und Englischen. Mögen wir diese den lat. Bildungen auf *-arius* oder den gotischen auf *-areis* gleichsetzen: wir haben es jedenfalls mit einer alten Kategorie zu tun, die sich ursprünglich auf Personen beschränkte, z. B. nhd. *Bäcker*, *Fischer*, *Gärtner*, *Jäger*, *Maler*, *Sänger*, engl. *baker, fisher, gardener, hunter, painter, singer.* Aber dann sprengt das Suffix seine ursprünglichen Schranken, und greift auf das Gebiet von Bildungssilben über, die ursprünglich ein Mittel oder Werkzeug bezeichnen. Die mit dem Suffix *-er* versehenen Gegenstände erscheinen dadurch halb personifiziert, indem sie als selbständig tätig hingestellt werden, mögen sie auch nur als Hülfsmittel bei einer Tätigkeit dienen. So z. B. nhd. *Bohrer, Dampfer, Halter, Schläger, Treffer, Wecker, Zeiger, Handschuhknöpfer, Hosenträger, Seelenwärmer, Schuhanzieher* u. dgl. Im Englischen sind Wörter dieser Art besonders zahlreich. Es gehören hierher z. B. *borer, breakers* (pl.), *buffer, bumper, burner, cracker, drainer, drawers* (pl.), *fritter, muffler, poker, rattler, rocker* (Am. = 'rocking chair'), *rubber, shutter, sprinkler, steamer, strainer, ticker,* ausserdem viele Komposita, z. T. neuesten Datums, z. B. *ash-receiver, cigar-holder, fly-catcher, fire-cracker, gas-lighter, lawn-mower, ocean-liner, paper-cutter, pen-holder, screw-holder, sky-scraper, steam-roller, torpedo-chaser.* Zur Kennzeichnung des heutigen Sprachgebrauchss genügt es hier ja, zu sagen (vgl. F. Blatz, *Nhd. Grammatik*,[3] Karlsruhe, 1895, S. 653), bei Ableitungen von Verbalstämmen finde sich das Suffix *-er* bei persönlichen oder sachlichen *nomina agentis.* Will man aber der geschichtlichen Entwicklung gerecht werden und zu wirklichem Verständnis gelangen, so wird man die Sache darstellen müssen, wie es O. Curme, *A Grammar of the German Language*, §245, I. 5, getan hat: "ER . . . masc. suffix, used to form appellations of male beings. . . . Figuratively *er* is often applied to names of lifeless objects: *Wecker* alarm clock, *Bohrer* gimlet."

Wie das Suffix *-er* den Begriff der Betätigung bei Gegenständen unter dem Bilde einer handelnden Person darstellt, so macht das Suffix *-ung* (oder *-ing*, bezw. *-ling*) den Begriff der Zugehörigkeit dadurch anschaulich und lebendig, dass er ihn der Abstammung des Sohnes vom Vater oder der Nachkommen vom Vorfahren gleichsetzt.

An dieser Meinung lasse ich mich auch dadurch nicht irre machen, dass R. Much in PB. Beitr. 17 (1893) S. 65 Grimms Ansicht entgegentrat, um seinerseits die das Suffix *-ing* enthaltenden altgermanischen Volksnamen als "Eigenschaftsbezeichnungen" zu fassen, denen Adjektive und Abstrakte zugrunde liegen sollen. Diese Auffassung steht ja in Einklang mit Muchs

Bemühung, den alten Volksnamen möglichst überall eine sinnvolle Bedeutung abzugewinnen. Aber seine Erklärungsmethode stiess sogleich auf Widerspruch bei H. Hirt, der in dem Aufsatze 'Die Deutung der german. Völkernamen' (PBB. 18, 512-519) geltend machte, es werde mit ihnen der sichere Boden wissenschaftlicher Forschung verlassen. Auf Muchs Entgegnung, die denselben Titel trägt (ebd. 20, 1-19), antwortete Hirt mit einem weiteren Aufsatze 'Nochmals die Deutung der german. Völkernamen' (ebd. 21, 125-159). Im Zusammenhange mit unserem Suffixe interessiert uns an dieser Erörterung namentlich Hirts Hinweis (an der letztgenannten Stelle, S. 143 Anm.) darauf, dass Much bei der Deutung von Namen auf *-ing-* mit seiner eignen Erklärung dieses Suffixes in Konflikt gerät; sowie sein wohlbegründeter Widerspruch (S. 156) gegen die hergebrachte Erklärung des Namens *Hermunduri*, von der Much bei seiner Deutung des Namens *Thuringi* als 'die wagenden,' (a. a. O., 17 S. 65) ausgegangen war. Da die hergebrachte Etymologie auch noch M. Schönfeld in seinem verdienstlichen *Wörterbuch der altgerm. Personen- u. Völkernamen* (Heidelberg, 1911) s.v. *Thuringi* als feststehend gilt, wird noch eine kurze Bemerkung darüber hier am Platze sein. K. Zeuss, der Urheber dieser Etymologie (*Die Deutschen u. die Nachbarstämme* S. 102) liess sich dabei von dem altnord. Verbum *þora* 'wagen' leiten. Aber dieses Verbum ist speziell nordisch, und muss trotz seiner einfachen Form, die den Schein einer altererbten Bildung gewährt, als verhältnismässig junge Neubildung gelten. Es ist an die Stelle des alten Präterito-Präsens got. *ga-dars*, pl. *ga-daursum*, inf. *ga-daursan* getreten, wahrscheinlich so, dass der im Nordischen zu erwartende Inf. **dorra(n)* nach dem Muster des Verbums *þola* 'dulden'— das sich als Gegenstück zu 'wagen' ansehen lässt—in *þora* umgewandelt wurde. Ein so alter Name wie *Ermun-duri* könnte, wenn er mit dem gemeingerm. Verbum (*ga-*)*dorsan* 'wagen' zusammenhinge, kaum anders als **Ermundorsi* lauten. Völlig einverstanden bin ich mit Schönfelds Bemerkung s.v. *Ermunduri:* "*Thuringi* ist also eine Art Kurzname zu *Ermen-duri.*" Aber diese Erklärung lässt sich mit der von Much befürworteten schwerlich vereinigen.

Am weitesten hat sich in der Beurteilung des *-ng-*Suffixes W. Wilmanns in seiner *Deutschen Grammatik*, Abt. 2 (2 Aufl., Strassburg, 1899) S. 278-283, von Jac. Grimm entfernt, und ist infolgedessen am gründlichsten in die Irre gegangen. "Das *ng*-Suffix," sagt er (S. 279, Anm. 2), "bedeutet zunächst nichts weiter, als dass das abgeleitete Wort zu dem Grundwort in irgend einer Beziehung steht (vgl. PBB. 17, 65); eine speziellere Anwendung hat es früh als patronymische Endung gefunden. Gr. 2, 349. von Bahder S. 169. 174." Ich erhalte von dieser Darstellung den Eindruck, dass Wilmanns versuchte, die drei verschiedenen Ansichten über das Suffix, die er bei seinen Vorgängern vorfand, unter einen Hut zu bringen. Als gemeinsamer abstrakter Ausdruck für Verwandtschaft (Grimm), Zugehörigkeit (v. Bahder) und Eigenschaft (Much) ergab sich ihm "irgend eine Beziehung." Er ist in den Fehler verfallen, der ja bei der Behandlung der Wortbildung nahe liegt, die verschiedenen Bedeutungen eines Suffixes als gleichberechtigt anzusehen, sie infolgedessen unter einem gemeinsamen Begriffe zu vereinigen, und dann letzteren als ursprüngliche Bedeutung an die Spitze zu stellen. In Wirklichkeit aber liegt die Sache meist so, wie bei dem oben berührten Suffixe *-er:* das Suffix hat eine charakteristische Bedeutung, die aber im Laufe der Zeit auf andre Wortkategorien übertragen wird oder sonstwie eine andre Färbung erhält. Als allgemeine Regel darf gelten, dass die anscheinend farblose Verwendung die jüngste ist. Die von Wilmanns bei unserem Suffixe als Ausgangspunkt gewählte Bedeutung ist völlig farblos. Es ist diejenige Bedeutung, welche allen Suffixen gemeinsam ist. Oder gibt es ein Suffix, das nicht zum Ausdrucke "irgend einer Beziehung . . . zu dem Grundworte" dient? Fassen wir nicht geradezu Suffixe und Flexionsendungen als Beziehungselemente zusammen, im Gegensatz zu dem materiellen Elemente des Wortes, der sogenannten Wurzel? Dass diese Deutung des *ng*- Suffixes nicht richtig sein kann, liegt, denke ich, auf der Hand. Die Frage ist nur: wie können wir ihr entgehen? Und auf diese Frage lässt sich eine sehr einfache und, wie ich glauben möchte, völlig ausreichende Antwort geben: wir müssen uns an die Anschauung gewöhnen, dass ein Suffix in bildlicher Bedeutung gebraucht werden kann.

Damit werden wir auf den Weg zurückgeführt, welchen Jac. Grimm bei der Darstellung der *ng*- Bildungen eingeschlagen hatte. Wir haben es mit einem Suffixe zu tun, das ursprünglich die Abstammung bezeichnete. Dieser Begriff lässt bildliche

Verwendung im weitesten Umfange zu, und es wird nur darauf ankommen, ob es uns gelingt, die in der Sprache ausgeprägte bildliche Anschauung wieder zu finden. Denn es ergeht den Wörtern, wie den Münzen, dass die Prägung im Laufe der Zeit sich abgreift und oft schwer zu erkennen ist.

Uns allen ist der biblische Sprachgebrauch geläufig, wonach die Nachkommen Jakobs als "die Kinder Israel" bezeichnet werden. Der Ausdruck "Kinder" schliesst hier viele Generationen von Kindern in sich, so dass er fast gleichbedeutend mit 'Angehörige' oder 'Leute ein und desselben Stammes' wird. Ferner werden wir unwillkürlich auch den Stammvater selber als Mitglied des Stammes betrachten. Ähnlich werden unter den Karolingern zwar zunächst die Nachfolger oder Nachkommen Karls des Grossen verstanden; zugleich aber gilt Karl selber als der erste der Karolinger. So erklärt sich auch eine auffällige Verschiedenheit im Gebrauche des Namens 'Wölsung,' mit der man sich seit W. Grimm, *Dt. Heldensage*, S. 16 (=^{3}18) abgemüht hat. Als Stammvater des Geschlechts der Wölsungen heisst Siegmunds Vater im *Beowulf* 898 *Wæls* (also germ. **Wals*), während die nordische Überlieferung (z. B. die ältere Edda) ihn *Vǫlsungr* (=ags. *Wælsing*) nennt. W. Grimm (a. a. O.) und J. Grimm (H. Zs. 1, 3=Kl. Schr. 7, 53) hielten die nordische Benennung für unrichtig, während R. Much, PBB. 17, 65 darin eine Bestätigung seiner Theorie findet, dass die mit *-ing* oder *-ung* gebildeten Namen nur eine Eigenschaft bezeichnen. Ich glaube mit Much, dass ein und dieselbe Person *Vals* oder *Vǫlsungr* genannt werden kann, möchte aber auch glauben, dass dies sich mit dem patronymischen Charakter des Suffixes *-ung* sehr gut verträgt. Bei dem ganz ähnlich gebildeten Namen *Nibelung* oder *Niflung* trägt der Stammvater des mythischen Geschlechtes schon allgemein denselben Namen wie seine Nachkommen.

Aus der Verwendung des Suffixes *-ung* oder *-ing*, zur Bezeichnung von Angehörigen eines Geschlechtes oder Stammes begreift sich auch leicht seine Beliebtheit bei appellativen Verwandtschaftsnamen, z. B. in nhd. *Nachkömmling* neben *Nachkomme*, und in dem gemeingermanischen Ausdruck für 'Verwandter': got. *gadiliggs*=ags. *gædeling*, as. *gaduling*, ahd. *gatiling*. Ähnlich ags. *ædeling*=ahd. *ediling*, mhd. u. mndd. *edeling*, zunächst 'der aus einem edlen Geschlecht kommende' oder 'zu den Edelleuten gehörig.' (Im Mhd. bedeutet *edelinc* sowohl nach Benecke-Müller wie nach Lexer überall 'Sohn eines Edelmannes,' im Mndd. nach Schiller-Lübben überall 'Edelmann.' Man beachte die Parallele mit *Wals* und *Wölsung*.)

Es handelt sich aber bei der Herkunft, und demgemäss bei der Funktion patronymer Suffixe, nicht ausschliesslich um den Ausdruck persönlicher Zugehörigkeit, sondern oft auch um die Art des Verhältnisses zwischen Vorfahr und Nachkommen oder zwischen dem Einzelnen und den Familienmitgliedern oder Stammesgenossen. Abstammung, Verwandtschaft, und Ähnlichkeit sind synonyme Begriffe. Man erwartet in dem Sohne die Züge der Eltern und die Eigenschaften der Vorfahren wiederzufinden, wie in dem Individuum den Typus seines Stammes. Solche Anschauungen verbinden sich von selbst mit der Bezeichnung der Herkunft. Zur Erläuterung kann schon das ebengenannte 'Edeling' dienen. Ein weiteres charakteristisches Beispiel liefert das Wort 'König' (ahd. as. *kuning*, ags. *cyning*), das von Bahder (S. 171) einleuchtend als 'den das Geschlecht . . . gleichsam in seiner Person repräsentierenden' erklärt hat. Man kann sich den Begriff auch schon etwa so klar machen, dass der König in seiner Person den ganzen Stamm (got. *kuni* 'Geschlecht, Stamm' = ahd. *kunni*, ags. *cynne*, engl. *kin*, anord. *kyn*) gewissermassen verkörpert. (Das *o* in an. *konungr*, das mit den übrigen altgerm. Sprachen in Widerspruch steht, wird auf nachträglicher Anlehnung an altn. *konr*, pl. *konir* 'Sohn, Mann' beruhen.)

Gerade der Begriff des Ebenbildes und der Verkörperung typischer Eigenschaften hat anscheinend dazu eingeladen, das patronyme Suffix von Personen auf Dinge jeder Art zu übertragen. Leicht verständlich ist z.B. die Anwendung auf verschiedene Arten von Äpfeln, für die Grimm 2, 350 mehrere alte Beispiele anführt; denn jede der Sorten ist besoderer Herkunft und repräsentiert eine typische Eigenart. Ähnlich bei Weinsorten (z.B. *Riessling*). Aber wie kommt der 'Däumling' (im Sinne von Überzug für den Daumen) und der 'Fäustling' (im Sinne von Fausthandschuh) zu dem patronymen Suffix? Der Däumling ist das Ebenbild des Daumens, nach ihm geformt, also gewissermassen von ihm ins Dasein gerufen; der Fäustling ebenso eine Reproduktion der Faust. Das Mittelhochdeutsche hat ähnlich *hendelinc*, d. i. Ebenbild der Hand, im Sinne von Fausthandschuh.

Die Sprache tut einen weiteren Schritt, indem sie durch das Herkunftssuffix lebende Wesen mit einem Adjektiv (nhd. *Jüng-ling*, *Neuling*) oder gar Verbum (nhd. *Säugling*) verknüpft, um auszudrücken, dass der Adjektiv- oder Verbalbegriff in ihnen lebendige Form gewonnen hat, also in ihnen verkörpert erscheint. Der Begriff der Abstammung ist somit auch hier—wenn auch nur bildlich—festgehalten, und man gibt den Zusammenhang mit der eigentlichen Funktion des Suffixes preis, wenn man in solchen Bildungen nur den Ausdruck eines wesentlichen Merkmales oder der Haupteigenschaft einer Person oder Sache sieht.

Die letztgenannten Beispiele zeigen das Suffix *-ing* mit vorausgehendem *l*, und gerade in dieser Form ist es ja im Nhd. so beliebt geworden und so sehr über sein altes Mass hinausgewachsen, dass man den Zusammenhang mit seiner eigentlichen Funktion nicht immer auf den ersten Blick erkennt. Gerade in dieser Richtung bleibt auch nach den als Stoffsammlung vortrefflichen Arbeiten, z.B. von Carl Müller ('Das Suffix *-ling*,' Zs. f. dt. Wortforschung 2, 186-201) und Charles G. Davis ('Die deutschen Substantiva auf *-ling* im 18. Jahrhundert,' ebd. 4, 161-209) noch viel zu tun übrig. Müller hebt zwar (S. 186) richtig hervor, dass man mit Schottel und Grimm von dem Grundbegriffe der Abstammung auszugehen hat. Aber er hat darauf verzichtet, den Zusammenhang im einzelnen klarzulegen. Und schon gleich bei Davis tritt dieser Gesichtspunkt wieder so sehr in den Hintergrund, dass er—wohl durch Wilmanns beeinflusst—bei der Aufzählung der Kategorien die Personennamen ans Ende verweist, statt sie an die Spitze zu stellen. Jedoch entschädigt uns Davis dafür einigermassen durch den Versuch (S. 162-167), eine Gruppierung der Ableitungen nach dem grammatischen Charakter des Grundwortes vorzunehmen. Auch das ist nicht immer leicht. Zwar wird man ihm ohne weiteres beistimmen, wenn er die von Adelung befürwortete Herleitung von Wörtern wie *Frömmling*, *Witzling* aus den Verben *frömmeln*, *witzeln* ablehnt. Aber ebenso ist er im Rechte, wenn er geltend macht, in Wörtern wie *Liebling*, *Mietling*, *Flüchtling* könne das Grundwort entweder als Substantiv oder als Verb aufgefasst werden. "Solche Fälle, wo ein Subst. und ein Verbum mit gleichem Stamm nebeneinander bestehen, sind häufig," fügt er hinzu, um dann zu versuchen, in

28 Fällen eine Entscheidung zu treffen. Ein solcher Versuch scheint mir aussichtslos, und auf keinen Fall kann ich mir den Vorschlag von Davis zu eigen machen, nur ein halbes Dutzend auf Substantive, die übrigen auf Verba zu beziehen. Zu den Ableitungen von Verben rechnet er z.B. das Wort *Lehrling*. Mir scheint *Lehr-* hier derselben Art wie in *Lehrjahre*, *Lehrjunge*, *Lehrzeit*, und von Haus aus das Subst. *die Lehre* zu enthalten, in Einklang mit Wendungen wie: 'in die Lehre gehen,' 'noch in der Lehre sein,' u. ähnl. Im Mhd. findet sich entsprechend (*lēr*(*e*)*-kint* oder *lēre-knabe* 'Lehrling, Schüler,' *lēre-kneht* 'Lehrling,' *lēre-tohter* 'weibl. Lehrling.' *lēre-meister* 'Lehrmeister,' u. a., neben *lēre* f. 'Lehre, Anleitung, Unterricht.' Es kommen im Mhd. auch parallele Bildungen mit *lern-* im ersten Gliede vor: *lern-kint*, *lern-knabe*, *lern-kneht*, *lern-tohter*. Aber sie müssen wol als Ersatzbildungen für die erstgenannten gelten, um dem Unterschiede zwischen dem Lehren des *lēremeister* und dem Lernen des *lēreknabe* Rechnung zu tragen. Dann zeigen sie, dass die Erinnerung an den Ursprung des ersten Kompositionsgliedes am Erlöschen war. Wie der 'Lehrling' als 'Sohn der Lehre,' so ist der 'Täufling' als 'Sohn der Taufe' oder 'Taufkind' bezeichnet. Ist der Ausdruck etwa auffälliger und die Anschauung schwierieger, als bei dem allbekannten nhd. 'Glückskind?' Bei einem Worte wie *Fremdling* (mhd. *vremdelinc*) haben wir die Wahl, in dem ersten Gliede das Adj. *fremd* oder das Masc. *der Fremde* oder das Fem. *die Fremde* (vgl. *die Ferne*, *die Höhe*, *die Tiefe*) zu sehen. Vielleicht legt die Sprache kein Gewicht darauf, bei diesem Worte zwischen der Deutung 'fremder Leute Kind' und 'Sohn der Fremde' zu scheiden. Jedenfalls verträgt sich das Suffix *-ling* sehr wohl mit abstrakten Substantiven, wie in *Günstling*, *Flüchtling*. Es entspricht das ganz der im Nhd. so häufigen bildlichen Verwendung des Wortes *Sohn* in Verbindung mit abstrakten oder unpersönlichen Begriffen. Der Titel, z.B., von Halms bekanntem Drama 'Der Sohn der Wildnis' ist in demselben Sinne gemeint, wie das Wort *der Wildling*. Man findet reichliche Belege im Grimmschen Wörterbuche unter *Sohn*[4] sowie in Sanders 'Wörterbuch der Dt. Sprache' unter *Sohn* 2d und *f*. Hier nur eine kleine Auswahl daraus: *eynen sun der ungehorsam und bosheyt* (Luther); *ihn, des Kummers müden Sohn* (Bürger); *ich, Sohn des Unglücks, zeige mich* (Schiller, *Don Carlos*); *der*

Mensch, der flüchtige Sohn der Stunde (ders., *Braut v. Messina*); *er nannte sich Sohn des Himmels, wie wir Günstlinge des Glücks Söhne des Glücks nennen* (Schiller); *der Künstler ist zwar der Sohn seiner Zeit, aber schlimm für ihn, wenn er zugleich ihr Zögling oder gar noch ihr Günstling ist* (Schiller); *sei mir gegrüsst, du Sohn von grossen Taten* (Tieck); *und es schwieg der Sohn der Lieder* (Uhland). Der Gebrauch ist so allgemein, dass man nach ähnlichen Beispielen nicht lange zu suchen braucht. Die beiden folgenden, z.B., gehören der Zeit nach dem Erscheinen der genannten Wörterbücher an: *der Sohn der Fremde* (Ztschr. d. Dt. Morgenländ. Gesellschaft, 1908, S. 106); *als echter Sohn des Jahrhunderts* (Kühnemann, *Herder*, 2. Aufl., München 1912, S. 336). Ähnlich im Französischen der bildliche Gebrauch von *fils*; z.B. *nous sommes les fils de la fortune*; im amerikan. "Slang" der von *son* in *a son of a gun*, (einer der Lieblingsausdrücke des Kapitäns in Stevensons Roman *The Wrecker*), nicht sehr verschieden von *a big gun*, etwa 'ein grosses Tier,' d.h. eine Respektsperson.

Schliesslich nur noch ein Wort über die Abstrakta auf *-ung*, im Nhd. ohne Zweifel die beliebteste Kategorie der *ng*-Formen, zugleich aber diejenige, welche von jeher die Sprachforscher in die grösste Verlegenheit gesetzt hat. Grimm gesteht (*Gramm.* 2, 364), dass die Berührung, welche zwischen dem Begriffe der Masc. auf *-ng* und dem der weibl. Abstrakta stattfinde, ihm unklar sei. Und noch jetzt gehen die Meinungen darüber auseinander, ob diese Abstrakta als urgermanisch gelten dürfen und wie sie zu erklären sind (vgl., z.B., v. Bahder, *Verbalabstracta*, S. 185 ff. und anders Wilmanns, *Dt. Gramm.* II^2 S. 375). Mir scheint v. Bahder den richtigen Weg eingeschlagen zu haben, wenn er auf die altnord. denominativen Feminina auf *-ung* mit abstrakter Bedeutung zurückgreift. Wie er hervorhebt (S. 187 f.), gehören Wörter wie *lausung* f. 'Unzuverlässigkeit, Trug' und *verþung* f. 'Gefolgschaft' nicht nur dem Sprachschatze der älteren Edda an, sondern erweisen sich durch die ihnen entsprechenden Wörter ags. *lēasung*, andd. *lōsunga* und ahd. *werdunga* als gemeinsam westgermanisch-nordisch. "Mit der Bildung der denominativen Abstrakta auf *-ungō-*," fährt v.Bahder fort, "hatte die Sprache den ersten Schritt getan, mit der Schöpfung der verbalen tat sie den zweiten, der von ungleich grösserem Erfolge begleitet sein sollte."

Dieser zweite Schritt wird sich am leichtesten begreifen, wenn wir annehmen, dass er von denominalen Bildungen ausging, die man zugleich als Deverbativa verstehen konnte. Als Bildung dieser Art lässt sich z.B. ahd. *samanunga* "Versammlung, Gemeinde" (im ältesten Ahd. noch in der Form *samanunc* erhalten) ansehen. *samanung*(*a*) ist wahrscheinlich von dem alten Adjektiv *saman*(*a*)- abgeleitet, das sich als Adverb (*saman* 'zugleich' Tat., Otfr.; vgl. *samant* Graff 6, 42, und das häufige *zisamane* 'zusammen') und in Ableitungen wie *gisamani* n. 'Versammlung, Menge' erhalten hat. Von demselben Adjektiv stammt das Verb ahd. *samanon* 'versammeln' = anord. *samna*, ags. *samnian*. Es lag nun nahe, *samanung*(*a*) und *gi-samanunga* auf den in *samanon* vorliegenden Verbalbegriff zu beziehen, und demgemäss als Ableitungen aus dem Verbum aufzufassen. Aus dieser Verknüpfung ergab sich dann ein bequemes Vorbild, um Verben auf *-on* und weiterhin Verben überhaupt eine Abstraktbildung auf *-unga* zur Seite zu stellen.

Wie bei den Masculina, so drückt das *ng*-Suffix auch hier ursprünglich die Abstammung aus und verleiht Gegenständen und abstrakten Verhältnissen gewissermassen das Fleisch und Blut lebender Wesen. Nur handelt es sich hier um Wörter, die durch ihre Endung und ihre Flexion deutlich als Feminina charakterisiert sind. Um ihren Gehalt voll zu würdigen und die Anschauung, aus der sie erwachsen sind, nachzuempfinden, brauchen wir nur statt des Suffixes den Begriff der Tochter oder den allgemeineren des Kindes einzusetzen. Und auch hier dürfen wir uns auf den bildlichen Ausdruck in Poesie und Prosa berufen, der in ähnlicher Weise das Wesen abstrakter Verhältnisse und lebloser Dinge durch den Hinweis auf ihre Herkunft uns näher rückt und anschaulich macht. Für die Wahl zwischen dem Femininum 'Tochter' und dem Neutrum 'Kind' ist dabei vorzugsweise das grammatische Genus des bildlich dargestellten Wortes entscheidend, nur dass 'Kind' nicht auf das Neutrum beschränkt ist und namentlich auch als gemeinsamer Ausdruck für Masc. und Fem. gilt. Der Gebrauch des Wortes *Kind* in übertragenem Sinne ist von Rud. Hildebrand im 5. Bande des Grimmschen Wörterbuches so gründlich erläutert, dass ich mich der Kürze halber darauf beschränken möchte, nur das aus Goethes Faust bekannte Wort:

> das Wunder ist des Glaubens liebstes Kind

anzuführen, um im übrigen auf die Darstellung Hildebrands zu verweisen. Es kommen hier in erster Linie die Abschnitte II 7. 10-12. 14 u. 15 s.v. 'Kind' in Betracht. Für 'Tochter' steht das Grimmsche Wörterbuch noch aus; einstweilen gewährt hier das Wörterbuch von Sanders wohl die beste Auskunft. Dort findet man Wendungen angeführt wie: *Gierigkeit, die Tochter und Gefährtin der Unwissenheit* (Forster); *weil die Bewunderung eine Tochter der Unwissenheit ist* (Kant); *diese feige Reue, mehr eine schwache Tochter der Unentschlossenheit als der Überlegung* (Schiller); *Töchterchen des Augenblicks ist das flüchtige Vergnügen* (Klamer Schmidt; das Diminutiv ist hier wohl nur gewählt, um Übereinstimmung mit dem grammatischen Genus von *Vergnügen* zu erzielen). In diesen Zusammenhang gehört auch der Anfang von Schillers Lied an die Freude:

> Freude, schöner Götterfunken, Tochter aus Elysium.

Kants pessimistischer Ausspruch über die Bewunderung stimmt ja zu dem *nil admirari* der Römer. Trotzdem wird man sagen müssen, dass z. B. die Bewunderung für die klassische Kunst eher ein Wissen auf dem Gebiete der Kunst voraussetzt. Die Sprache nimmt in solchen Fragen keine Partei. Sie bezeichnet das Wort durch das Abstammungssuffix zwar auch als eine Art Tochter, aber nur als die des Begriffes 'bewundern.' Bei abgeleiteten Verben und weiterhin bei Verben überhaupt war ein solcher Begriff in allgemeiner Form immer schon durch den Infinitiv gegeben. Man brauchte nur für die Infinitivendung das Abstammungssuffix einzusetzen, um dem allgemeinen Begriffe eine mehr konkrete, fassbare Form zu geben. Diese zuweilen sehr deutliche, oft aber auch kaum merkbare Umformung des im Infinitiv ganz abstrakt hingestellten Verbalbegriffes kleidet die Sprache in das Bild der Abstammung, oder, genauer gesprochen, in das Verhältnis der Tochter oder des Kindes zur Mutter. Hildebrand a. a. O. (Grimms Wb. 5, 723, *g*) schreibt dem Worte Kind unter andren die Bdtg. 'Ausgeburt' zu. Mögen wir dieses oder irgend ein andres Wort an Stelle von 'Tochter' einsetzen, um uns die ursprüngliche Funktion des Suffixes klar zu machen; jedenfalls werden wir an zwei Gesichtspunkten festhalten müssen.

1) Die Feminina auf *-ung* stehen ihrer Bedeutung nach von

Haus aus nicht mit dem Infinitiv oder dem allgemeinen Verbalbegriff auf einer Stufe, sondern erscheinen nur als mit diesem Begriffe verwandt oder, genauer ausgedrückt, aus ihm abgeleitet.

2) Ähnlich wie bei den Masculina auf *-ling* ist damit für die weitere Entwicklung dieser Klasse ein breiter Spielraum gegeben. In der Regel bleibt der Zusammenhang mit dem Verbalbegriffe durchsichtig, so dass es nahe liegt, diese Feminina als Verbalnomina im Sinne eines substantivierten Infinitivs zu verwenden. Aber in solchen Fällen ist ihre eigentlich Bedeutung schon etwas verblasst, und zudem wird selbst bei anscheinend ganz abstrakten Ausdrücken wie *Einteilung, Überzeugung, Verwendung* die Stufe des Infinitivs kaum erreicht. Es bleibt wenigstens noch ein Rest gegenständlicher Auffassung, der gleich in Ausdrücken wie *eine Einteilung vornehmen, die Überzeugung gewinnen, Verwendung finden*, hervortritt, mögen auch diese Ausdrücke synonym sein mit den Infinitiven *einteilen, sich überzeugen, verwendet werden.* Rein gegenständlich aber werden Wörter wie *Festung, Quittung, Rechnung, Postanweisung* empfunden. Hier haben die Nomina den Verbalbegriff so völlig verloren, dass man nachdenken muss, um ihn wieder zu finden. Eine Mittelstellung nimmt die Hauptmasse der *ung*-Bildungen ein, wie etwa *Äusserung, Gründung, Richtung, Wendung*, usw. Der Zusammenhang mit dem Verbalbegriffe liegt hier klar zu Tage, zugleich aber ist die Bedeutung eigenartig.

Blicken wir auf den Ausgangspunkt unsrer Untersuchung zurück, so werden wir nicht zweifeln, dass sich in *sunufatarungo* ein altertümlicher Gebrauch des Suffixes erhalten hat, der völlig in Einklang steht mit den alten mythischen Namen der Heldensage wie *Amelungen, Nibelungen, Wölsungen.* Von hier aus bis zu Wörtern wie *Rechnung* und *Quittung* ist zwar ein weiter Weg. Aber hoffentlich sind wir nicht fehlgegangen. Und vielleicht haben wir uns unterwegs überzeugt, dass die Grammatik gut daran tun wird, mit der bildlichen Verwendung von Suffixen (insbesondere bei der Übertragung persönlicher Suffixe auf sachliche Kategorien) künftig mehr zu rechnen, als sie bisher gewohnt war.

HERMANN COLLITZ

Johns Hopkins University

MODERN WELSH VERSIONS OF THE ARTHURIAN STORIES

Although works dealing with the Arthurian story in modern times are by no means as numerous as those which cover the earlier periods, yet the student is not left to shift entirely for himself in this field. The books of Professor MacCallum and Professor Maynadier for example give all that the ordinary inquirer needs to know about the English versions of the story down to the time of their publication, and by a small amount of annotating they may be brought down to date. The former, too, devotes considerable space to the French and German versions of the story but neither in these books nor anywhere else have I been able to find any consideration of the modern Welsh treatment of it. Yet in the number of stories written on this subject in recent years the Welsh rank ahead of both the French and the Germans and not far behind the English, and several of the poems are of decided literary merit. It is to give the reader who knows no Welsh some idea of what is being done in that language[1]—"Amheus pob anwybod (Everything not known is doubtful)," as the Welsh proverb says—by pointing out the general characteristics of the movement and by giving summaries of some of the more important poems, that I have undertaken the following article.[2]

The Welsh Arthur stories deserve a certain amount of consideration also from the fact that they are one of the manifestations of that racial consciousness that is so strong in the Celt. We are most familiar with it in the political disturbances in Ireland and in certain phases of Anglo-Irish literature, but in the Brythonic countries it is no less active. While both

---

[1] The English reader can get some idea of the character of this movement from the poems and plays of Mr. Ernest Rhys who, although he writes in English, is thoroughly saturated with the Welsh spirit.

[2] I do not pretend that this list is complete; the meagerness of the Welsh collections available in this country makes that impossible to hope for. I do believe however that the examples I give are representative of the tendencies existing in modern Welsh literature, and that I have included the more important poems dealing with the Arthurian material. For an adequate treatment of the equally interesting subject of the Arthurian stories in Brittany I have not the necessary materials at hand as yet.

Wales and Brittany are desirous of greater freedom in determining their own political and economic affairs, the movement in these countries has been largely linguistic and literary rather than political. Even in Cornwall there have been attempts on the part of some people to join in this movement by reviving the ancient language and poems have been written and speeches made in Cornish, although these are probably intelligible to a far larger number of people in Brittany than in Cornwall itself. But in the two former countries[3] there is to-day a strong and vigorous literature in the native tongue drawing its inspiration either from the past history of the Celt or from the life of the ordinary Welshman or Breton of to-day. In either case the attempt is made to emphasize the fact that the Celts are a race distinct from either Saxon or Gaul; to this purpose the story of Arthur, the Celtic hero, lends itself admirably and it is in this way that it has been used by many of the Welsh writers.

But in Wales the use of the story for this purpose has been complicated by the presence of what some Welsh critics have called "Puritanism" (although in this country that term has lately been applied to something very different), and even to-day that influence has not been wholly eliminated although it is lessened. Until very recently almost the only people in Wales who possessed any book-learning and still kept to the old language were the ministers of the various dissenting churches. They it was who wrote most of the poetry—the novel and the drama were considered improper for Christians to meddle with—and they practically controlled the eisteddfod and dictated the choice of subjects for its competitions. Hence it was that while in England poets were producing *The Idylls of the King* and *The Defence of Guenevere*, the Welsh poets were busying themselves with such subjects as *Emmanuel*,[4] *The Destruction of Jerusalem* (*Awdl Dinystr Ierusalem*),[5] or *Charity* (*Elusengarwch*).[6] Even in the latter part of last century *Eifion Wyn* (*Eliseus Williams*) was denied a prize for his poem on *The Shepherd* (*Y Bugail*) because in it he made no mention of any but earthly shepherds.[7] In such an atmosphere as this it was next to impossible to write about King Arthur and his court; the few mentions we do find of him are in pseudo-historical works such as Dewi Wyn's (David Owen) *Ode in Praise of the Island of Britain* (*Awdl Molawd Ynys Prydain*)[8] written in 1805, or Cynddelw's (Robert Ellis) *Ode on the Race of the Welsh* (*Awdl Cenedl y Cymry*).[9] The former mentions briefly Arthur "whose bright praise shall long endure" (pery yn hîr ei glîr glôd), his sword Caledfwlch, and Medrod "whose name rots."[10] The latter devotes ten lines to Arthur and his defense of Britain, and eleven more to Geraint who fell in the battle of Llongborth.[11] Neither author shows the least feeling for the romantic elements of the story.

---

[3] Wales and Brittany are doing much at the present day that is calculated to draw them closer together. The Welsh National anthem *Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau* has been adopted by the Bretons with words by Taldir (François Jaffrennou) under the title *Bro Goz Ma Zadou*. A number of Breton poets have been invested at the Welsh eisteddfod, and since 1901 Brittany has had her own Gorsedd and her own eisteddfodau. At the eisteddfod is performed the symbolic "joining of the sword," half of which is kept by each nation, in order to signify that the two peoples are essentially one.

The only person of any note to deal with the romantic portions of the Arthur story during the nineteenth century—for the *Can o Hanes y Carwr Trwstan*[12] (*Poem from the Story of Tristan the Lover*) of Twm o'r Nant (Thomas Edwards)is hardly Arthurian in spite of its title—was that self-satisfied literary rebel Llew Llwyfo (Lewis William Lewis).[13] He chose the subject of Modred's love for Guinevere and his consequent rebellion against his uncle, Arthur, as the subject for his poem *Gwenhwyfar*[13a] submitted to the eisteddfod at Merthyr Tydfil in 1859.[14] The materials for this poem, a "dramatic epic after the style of those of Goethe (arwrgerdd dramataidd . . . megis Arwrgerddi Goethe[15])," are taken largely from Geoffrey of Monmouth with the addition of a few details from the triads, but the whole is shaped by the author's own invention. The story briefly is as follows:

---

[4] Gwilym Hiraethog. *Emmanuel; neu Ganolbwngc Gweithredoedd a Llywodraeth Duw.* 2 vol. Dinbych, 1861–1867.

[5] Eben Fardd. *Gweithiau Barddonol, &c.* Bryngwydion [1873], p. 46.

[6] *Blodau Arfon; sef, Gwaith yr Anfarwol Fardd Dewi Wyn.* Caerlleon, 1842, p. 73.

[7] T. Gwynn Jones. *Llenyddiaeth Gymraeg y Bedwaredd Ganrif ar Bymtheg.* Caernarfon, 1920. p. 33.

[8] *Blodau Arfon.* p. 1.

[9] *Barddoniaeth Cynddelw.* Caernarfon, 1877. p. 9.

[10] *Blodau Arfon.* p. 25.

[11] *Barddoniaeth Cynddelw*, p. 51.

[12] *Gwaith Thomas Edwards* (*Twm o'r Nant*) Liverpool, 1874, p. 460. I am using the term "nineteenth century" somewhat loosely since this poem was first published in 1790.

[13] *Gemau Llwyfo*, Utica, N. Y., 1868. T. R. Roberts, in his *Eminent Welshmen* (p. 310) mentions an edition published in Liverpool in that year, but in view of the very positive statements made in the preface to the Utica edition (Dec. 1868) it seems that this must be an error.

> Gwenhwyfar, waiting vainly for news of Arthur and his Roman wars, asks Medrawd, in whom she has the utmost confidence, to send ten trusty messengers to different parts of the continent, each with instructions not to return without news from the king. Medrawd instead gets Iddog to forge a letter which he then takes to Gwenhwyfar. It purports to be from Arthur to Medrawd, telling him that since coming to the continent he has fallen in love with another woman and therefore he desires to have Gwenhwyfar put quietly out of the way. Medrawd renews his protestations of love for her and of Arthur's unfaithfulness, but in spite of the letter, which she believes genuine, she rejects him. Medrawd's next step is to introduce Rhitta as a messenger coming from the army. Rhitta tells Gwenhwyfar that in the last battle Arthur was much changed and all laid it to the French woman with whom he had fallen in love. His army was defeated and he himself stopped in the midst of an ignominious flight and committed suicide. Gwenhwyfar is finally won over to marry Medrawd, whom she respects but says she can never love. Meanwhile Arthur, who has defeated the Romans under Lucius and Cotta and is about to cross the Alps to Rome, hears of Medrawd's treachery; he divides his forces, sending Hoel

---

[13a] At the International Eisteddfod held in Chicago in 1893 a prize of one hundred dollars was awarded to the Rev. Erasmus W. Jones for a translation of this poem into English. So far as I have been able to discover, this translation has never been printed.

[14] Evidently the subject at this eisteddfod was not fixed, as it usually is. See Jones, *Llenyddiaeth*, p. 30.

[15] *Gemau Llwyfo*, p. 45. The translations throughout are my own. I have tried to make them idiomatic rather than pedantically literal.

with part of the army to attack Rome, while he himself returns with the rest to Britain. On his approach Gwenhwyfar flees to the nunnery at Afallon, while Medrawd prepares to resist. He makes his men drunk to keep up their courage but they are defeated and he himself is killed by Arthur. Iddog however mortally wounds Arthur with an arrow. Arthur is carried to the nunnery at Afallon where he meets Gwenhwyfar, forgives her, and dies in her arms.[16]

Again in 1866 Llew Llwyfo tried his hand on an Arthurian subject—this time in his poem *Arthur y Ford Gron*[17] (*Arthur of the Round Table*) which won the prize at the eisteddfod in Chester in that year. This poem, as the author says,[18] covers the same ground as *Gwenhwyfar* and is in his opinion better, being less dramatic but more heroic, slower but more dignified (yn fwy *arwrol* ac yn llai dramataidd—yn arafach ond yn fwy urddasol). In several important incidents and in many minor ones this poem differs from the other.

In the beginning Medrawd holds a council, decides on rebellion against Arthur, and tells that as a preparation for it he has sent Celdric back to Germany for additional forces. Arthur meanwhile is encamped in the Alps where, at a banquet of the Knights of the Round Table, Peredur tells the story of Arthur's early battles, his dream, and his fight with the giant much as they are related by Geoffrey of Monmouth. The next morning comes news of Medrawd's treachery, and Arthur returns to Britain with part of his forces. Upon landing he is everywhere received with joy because of the cruelty of Medrawd and the pagans. An example of this cruelty is the plot to kidnap Enid to give her as a bribe to Celdric to keep him contented. She is saved from him only by the fact that his men call him to lead them to the battle and he is forced to leave her. Both armies march to Camlan; Medrawd is entrenched on a hill and waits for Arthur to attack him, which the latter does not wish to do because of a warning dream he has had.

---

[16] Another summary, not particularly flattering, is given by Elphin (R. A. Griffith) in his article on *Yr Arwrgerdd Gymreig*, in *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion 1904–05*, p. 37.

[17] *Gemau Llwyfo*, p. 120.

[18] *ibid.*, p. 119.

The two leaders, each with seven followers, meet between the lines, and then the poem ends with a version of the chapter (Book XXI, Chap. IV) which Malory entitles, "How by misadventure of an adder the battle began." It seems as though Llew Llwyfo, finding the time short before the meeting of the eisteddfod, has been obliged to send in his poem in an unfinished condition. But both this poem and *Gwenhwyfar* are but fragments of a longer poem that he intended to write. He tells us in the preface to *Arthur y Ford Gron* as printed in *Gemau Llwyfo*[19] that it was his life's dream that he should be able to use both poems in the composition of a Welsh national epic which when he was dust should become "the subject of the attention of the nations of the world, and should make the critics of the earth confess that there is in the Welsh language one great, superior, heroic, and truly national composition (cyfansoddiad mawr, uchelradd, arwrol, a gwir genedlaethol), one that can be, and will be, translated into every literary language under the shining sun." He died without realizing his ambition, and it is perhaps significant of the attitude of his countrymen at this time toward the story, that he was unable to get a Welsh publisher to accept what he had done in that direction, and he was obliged to come to the United States before he could find a printer for it.[20]

It was a number of years after this before another serious attempt was made to make use of the Arthur stories. At the National Eisteddfod held at Llanelly in 1895, a prize was offered for the best libretto on the subject of Myrddin (Merlin) and there were two contestants. In 1897 at Newport *Arthur y Ford Gron* (*Arthur of the Round Table*) was again assigned as the subject for an "arwrgerdd" (epic or heroic poem). The results were not such as to encourage the committee to repeat the experiment, but in 1901 at the National Eisteddfod held at Merthyr Tydfil a prize was offered for a "rhiaingerdd" (love poem) on *Cilhwch ac Olwen* (*Cilhwch and Olwen*), and the results were more promising. In the following year at Bangor, Arthurian subjects were assigned for both of the main literary competitions, the "subject of the chair"[21] being *Ymadawiad Arthur* (*The Departure of Arthur*), and the "subject of the crown" *Trystan ac Essyllt* (*Tristan and Iseult*). In 1904 at Rhyl the subject of the chair was *Geraint ac Enid* (*Geraint and Enid*), and in 1907 at Swansea the subject of the crown was *Y Greal Santaidd* (*The Holy Grail*). In 1915 at Bangor William Morris's *Defence of Guenevere* was chosen as the subject for translation from English into Welsh, and in 1918 at Neath the subject assigned for the "rhieingerdd" was *Olwen*. From time to time still other Arthurian poems have been produced without the stimulus of an eisteddfodic contest.[22]

---

[19] p. 119.

[20] *ibid.*, p. 5.

The prize offered at the 1895 eisteddfod for a libretto on Myrddin was awarded to Gwili (John Jenkins).[23] Under the conditions governing the competition the poem was limited to 300 lines and as the author has crowded into it four acts and thirteen scenes he is able to give but the barest outline of a story. Myrddin claims the newly-born Arthur of his father Uther and gives him to Ector to be brought up. Later upon the death of Uther, Arthur, after all others have failed, draws the sword from its sheath (o'r waen) and becomes king of Britain. In the third act he has been wounded in battle and has lost this sword; Myrddin leads him to the lake where he receives Caledfwlch. In the last act Arthur sends to Lodigran to ask for the hand of his daughter Gwenhwyfar; he receives her, and with her the Round Table; he establishes the Order of The Round Table, and dedicates himself and his knights to God, whereupon Myrddin dies, his work now completed.

---

[21] At the National Eisteddfod a carved oaken chair is given as a prize for the best poem on a designated subject written in the "strict metres" (mesurau caethion), the old Welsh alliterative metres, and a silver crown for another similarly composed in the "free metres" (mesurau rhyddion) which are based on the English metrical schemes.

[22] Along with this movement has gone a revival of interest in the non-Arthurian portions of the Mabinogion. In 1906 the subject of the crown at Carnarvon was *Branwen ferch Llyr* (*Branwen the daughter of Lear*); in 1917 at Birkenhead it was *Pwyll Pendefig Dyfed* (*Pwyll, Prince of Dyfed*); in 1921 at Carnarvon the contestant for the crown was given a choice of four subjects, one of which was *Breuddwyd Macsen* (*The Dream of Maxen*). A number of minor poems of the same type have been produced also.

[23] *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Buddugol Eisteddfod Llanelli, 1895.* London, 1898.

At Newport two years later the prize for a "heroic poem" (arwrgerdd) on the subject of *Arthur y Ford Gron* was awarded to the Rev. T. Mafonwy Davies.[24] Very probably his poem was the best of the nine submitted, but one wonders somewhat whether the three dissenting ministers (Dyfed, Ceulanydd, and Elfed) who acted as judges based their decision solely upon the poetic merits of the poem, or whether they took into consideration the moral tone as well. One of the judges, who voted at first for another of the poems, objected to the presentation of the sin of Guinevere as being a dark blot upon this poem, and expressed his disappointment at seeing the author mar his work in this way.[25] Mr. Davies' poem may be described as a Welsh version of Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* with all the poetry left out of it, and with the moral greatly emphasized and so labelled that the most careless reader cannot miss it. The author begins by asking whether Arthur is a real person or a poetic creation and answering his own question he says that he is both—"His dress is poetry but I see a man in it";[26] so he "listens at the closed door of the ages"[27] and gets the story. The summary which the author prefixed to his poem, while it leaves out little touches such as Arthur's moistening the blade of Caledfwlch with his tears before striking with it,[28] gives a pretty good idea of the general tone of the poem.

> The heroism of justice (cyfiawnder)—the boy Arthur—justice begins to bud in his character in the house of Hector, his foster-father—protects the wretched and his native land in the face of wrong.—Justice gives him energy and courage—chases away the enemy—finds the crown of some king under the feet of his horse—puts it on his head—feels a

---

[24] *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Eisteddfod Genedlaethol 1897* (*Casnewydd-ar-Wysg.*) p. 40.

[25] *ibid.*, p. 39.

[26] A chwiliaf fi drwy'r niwl am fylchog gledd
Na chafodd un fudolaeth;—neu am fedd
Yr hwn sydd heb ei gladdu,—marw na byw,—
Arthur? Ai person neu farddoniaeth yw?
Y ddau.—Barddoniaeth yw ei wisg, ond dyn
A welaf dani. *ibid.*, p. 41.

[27] Clustfeiniaf fi wrth gauad-ddor yr oesau *ibid.*

[28] Mae'm cledd yn llaith
Gan ddagrau cyn eu taro,—galed waith! *ibid.*, p. 45.

desire to be a king for the sake of getting justice into the laws.

I. The "Crown" and the "Cross" = THE CHRISTIAN KING.

Coronation day in Caerlleon—Myrddin tells Arthur his story—the justice of Arthur turns to grief and anger after hearing how he was begotten—offended at Myrddin for helping his father to sin—thinks to remove the shame of his father and of his country by living and serving justice—establishes laws to defend the wretched and punish the wicked.—Justice in punishments and rewards—joy of the weak and the poor—the responsibility makes Arthur's soul sober.

II. "Excalibur"—the "Dragon" = THE NATIONAL WARRIOR.

Treachery and oppression raise the rudiments of justice in Arthur's bosom—raises the sword to defend it—justice in his brotherly love and in his patriotism—his crushed feeling at administering justice on his brothers with the sword—overcomes his enemies at home—order—overcomes the *aggressive* foreigners and makes them acknowledge his laws. Myrddin puts into rhyme a list of Arthur's battles—shows the victory of justice in them all—looks at Gwenhwyfar and his song becomes silent.

III. The "Round Table" = THE JUST JUDGE.

The Round Table—the kingdom of justice and order—the judgment-hall of Arthur where his justice is administered—the needs of nature and of man are supplied—the victory of justice—the golden age of Arthur.—The soberness and severity of Arthur kill the love of Gwenhwyfar—she turns to Launcelot for sympathy—the two fall—the influence of their fall upon the court—others follow their example.—The sharp justice of Arthur becomes an element of pain in the court—the knights, having failed to live the laws of Arthur, seek to get his reputation by following the Holy Grail—fail.—The love of Arthur for Gwenhwyfar turns to anger against her—seeks to administer punishment to her.—

Launcelot defends her—war—destruction.—Arthur continues to fight and to administer justice.

IV. "AVALON" = THE IMMORTAL CONQUEROR.

Arthur sees the world forsake justice for a time—night and the last battle—kills the traitor Medrod and his army—he himself is wounded by the traitor—the country is sacrificed.—Arthur sleeps in his blood near the altar—dreams—sees that the life of sacrifice is the highest—sees the victory of justice—Gwenhwyfar, Launcelot, and Myrddin in their monasteries repent—they return in their tears and seek for him in the paths of justice—Myrddin announces to him (in his sleep) that he is not to die—to go to "Avalon"—to return constantly to fight the battles of justice and to win them—the country follows him to some Avalon—the immortal conqueror.

Certainly the romantic revival has not yet touched the Arthur story in Wales.

Of the poems submitted in 1902 on the subject of the departure of Arthur nearly all were of this same type ("soliloquies, meditations, essays on the influence of Arthur, Arthur yet living, etc.").[29] Among them however was one of a very different type—the "Awdl" (poem in the strict metres) of Mr. T. Gwynn Jones.[30] This is a work of real poetic merit. It follows closely Malory's account of Arthur's departure, and therefore at once challenges comparison with Tennyson's poem on the same subject which it so closely resembles. One critic has expressed, although perhaps not quite fairly to Tennyson, the essential difference between the two poems: "The two characteristics of the Awdl are Dramatic Movement and Concentration. Two characteristics of Tennyson's Passing of Arthur are Eloquence and Fine Writing. King Arthur in the Awdl is a dying desperate man. In Tennyson he is a polished deliberate speaker, with a tendency to exaggerate, and a love of show. In the Awdl Arthur is Arthur. In the Idyll he is the Poet trying to be Arthur."[31] Part of the terseness which makes the Awdl so effective comes from the use of the "mesurau caethion,"[32] which lend themselves naturally to compression, but more of it is due to the author's deliberate treatment of his subject. The story as he tells it is as follows:

---

[29] Translation of the adjudication of Sir John Morris Jones. *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Buddugol Eisteddfod Bangor, 1902.* Liverpool, 1903, p. 1.

[30] Both this poem and the winning "Pryddest" on Tristan and Iseult were published in *Cofnodion . . . Bangor, 1902,* and both are reviewed by Elphin (R. A. Griffith) in *Y Cymmrodor,* XVI, *140-168.* The Awdl was later published in *Ymadawiad Arthur a Chaniadau Ereill.* Carnarvon, 1910.

> Over the tumult of Camlan rises the cry "Medrawd is killed," and Medrawd's army turns in flight followed by that of Arthur, leaving only two persons alive on the field of battle, "the one like a god of carnage with his weight on the fair hilt of his sword, and the other beside him, amazed, watching him."[33] To Bedwyr's inquiry as to why he has left his men, Arthur replies that he is seriously wounded[34] and asks to be helped from the field. So Bedwyr carries him to a green glade near by and lays him down by the stream. At Arthur's command he takes Caledfwlch (Excalibur) to a near-by lake, but as he is about to cast it in he hears the croak of a raven, and this calls to his mind the old stanza,
>
> Hast thou heard what the raven sang,
> Is it good or bad his foreboding?
> "There shall be no strong man without a fair sword."[35]

---

[31] William Hughes Jones. *At the Foot of Eryri.* Bangor, 1912., p. 160.

[32] Very brief treatments of these metres may be found in H. Idris Bell's *Poems From the Welsh*, p. 9, and in Alfred Percival Graves' *Welsh Poetry Old and New in English Verse*, p. 135. Somewhat more full are *The Rules and Metres of Welsh Poetry* by H. Elvet Lewis (*Transactions of the Society of the Cymmrodorion for 1902–3*, p. 76), and *Welsh Versification* by Sir John Morris Jones (*Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, IV, 106). A full and clear explanation (in Welsh) of the whole matter is given by Dafydd Morganwg (David William Jones) in *Yr Ysgol Farddol.* (5th edition Carmarthen, 1911.)

[33] Yno, mal duw celanedd,
A'i bwys ar garn glwys ei gledd,
Yr naill oedd, a'r llall ger llaw
A golwg syn, yn gwyliaw. p. 4.

[34] Ebr yntau: "Clyw, brwnt y clwyf
Hwn; clyw Fedwyr, claf ydwyf." p. 4.

[35] Glywaist ti a gant y fran,
Ai drwg ai da'r darogan,
Na fid cryf heb gleddyf glân p. 8.

This triplet is modelled after the old Welsh poetry such as "The Sayings of the Wise (Chwedlau'r Doethion)." See for example the *Iolo MSS.*, pp. 260-261.

> Bedwyr looks again at the sword and feels that to throw it away would be a great mistake and that Arthur must have been distracted by the pain of his wound when he ordered it done, so he hides the sword in a cave not far away and returns to the King. As in Tennyson's poem he is sent back a second, and again a third time with emphatic orders to throw the sword into the lake. On the third trip he does hurl it away and a hand comes up out of the water and catches it. When he returns and tells this to the king Arthur bids him carry him to the shores of the lake. There they find a vessel, not dark like Tennyson's but brightly colored, and the three maidens receive Arthur on board. Bedwyr asks to go too, saying simply, "Together we were in battle; together from the world let us escape the day of death,"[36] but one of the maidens replies, "Be thou silent, the end is not yet come; Arthur shall never sink into the grave; as for thee, go, there is work yet remaining for thee ere thou goest to rest,"[37] and as the boat sails Arthur says to him, "Be not sad; I go now to the fine summer weather of Afallon to recover, but I shall come back again to my people, and when the day comes I shall restore them, victorious, their renown among the nations."[38] As the ship sails away Bedwyr hears sweet voices singing of Afallon, and then a fog slowly spreads over the lake and into it the vessel vanishes like a phantom.

No summary of this poem can give any adequate idea of the swift movement and dramatic power of it. It is without a doubt the best thing the Welsh have produced on King Arthur in modern times, and it is worthy to rank with the best in any language.

[36] Ynghyd y buom ynghadau, ynghyd
O'r byd caffom ddiengyd ddydd angau. p. 18.

[37] Bid iti dewi, ni ddaeth y diwedd;
Arthur byth ni syrth i'r bedd; tithau dos,
Y mae'n d'aros waith cyn mynd i orwedd. p. 18.

[38] "Na bydd alarus," eb o:
"Mi weithion i hinon ha
Afallon af i wella;
Ond i fy nhud dof yn ol,
Hi ddygaf yn fuddugol
Eto, wedi delo dydd
Ei bri ymysg y broydd." p. 18.

The *Tristan and Iseult*[39] of R. Silyn Roberts, the other prize-winning poem at the Bangor Eisteddfod of 1902, is of a very different character. In the first place the metre is modelled upon those of England instead of on the old Welsh forms, and in the hands of the author it often lacks the dignity that the subject demands. Perhaps the most striking example of this is to be found in Part V where Trystan, sick in Brittany, turns his face toward Cornwall, "whispering the anguish of his breast into the ear of his harp (wrth suo cynni'i fron yng nghlust ei delyn),"[40] to a tune that makes one think at once of *Annabel Lee.* Again Trystan after his return from Ireland sits on a rock on the Cornish coast and sings to the breezes a song of Esyllt[41] modelled probably after the old Welsh-song of *Menira Gwen* but reminding the American reader of *Here's to Good Old Yale.* That the poem seems just as undignified to the native Welshman is, I think, sufficiently clear from the review of it by Elphin (R. A. Griffith),[42] himself a Welsh poet of considerable note. Neither the phraseology nor the metrical form seems to him worthy of the subject.[43]

In subject matter too there is a great difference between the two poems. The Awdl is wholly tragic, and the action is compressed into the space of perhaps an hour. The Pryddest is largely romantic, and the action occupies several years.

---

[39] R. Silyn Roberts. *Trystan ac Esyllt a Chaniadau Eraill.* Bangor, 1904. The text given there is changed slightly from the original form. (See note 30.)

[40] *ibid.*, p. 60.

[41] *ibid.*, p. 18.

[42] *Y Cymmrodor.* XVI, 154-168.

[43] He attempts to translate one couplet so as to give the English reader the same impression that the original would give to a Welshman, and evolves the following:

His eye flashed out in anger fierce, he gave the Pat a shove,
My golden harp has won the girl, a fiddler she's above.

Perhaps it was this criticism that caused the author to change, "I'r Gwyddel rhoddodd wth (he gave the Irishman a shove)" to "Ymaith, anghenfil rhwth (Away gaping monster)" when he reprinted the poem in the collected edition of his works.

Elphin also points out in his review the extent to which Mr. Roberts is indebted to Swinburne and other poets, not only for the ideas of many of his best passages but often even to the words of whole lines.

A summary of the poem will perhaps make the difference more clear.

In Part I we find a vessel driving toward the coast of Ireland in a March storm and on board it a wounded man.

> But who is the man? Why is his aspect sad?
> Why does the grey of the grave cover his splendor?[44]

The answer to this question occupies the rest of the canto, and tells us of Trystan's birth and rearing, of his fight with Morollt, and of his attempts to find a cure for his wound. Part II begins with Trystan sitting on the Cornish coast singing of Esyllt. March (Mark), passing by, hears him and asks if she is more beautiful than Gwenhwyfar. Trystan assures him that she is, and tells March the story of his trip to Ireland—how by his harping he had won the favor of the king and queen and had been healed of his wound. March falls in love with the maiden Esyllt whom he has never seen, and upon the advice of Trystan's enemies he sends his nephew to Ireland to win her and bring her back to Cornwall. Trystan, upon his arrival, kills the dragon that is wasting the country, and when he is brought to court to receive his reward, the hand of the princess, Esyllt recognizes in him her old teacher Tantrys. Later she discovers from the notch in his sword that he is the Trystan who killed Morollt, but she quickly finds that her love for Tantrys is stronger than her hatred for Trystan. Part III opens with Trystan and Esyllt aboard ship on their way back to Cornwall. They are already in love with each other but neither is ready to admit it. Esyllt pretends to be homesick and asks Trystan to sing to her. When the song is finished Trystan takes the oars—the rowers have all fallen asleep from weariness—and drives the vessel onward. After a time Esyllt sends Branwen to sleep and whispers,

> Trystan leave your rowing,
> And sit here a while to rest yourself.
> Tell me the story of the love of Gwenhwyfar,
> And Lancelot, her brave matchless knight.[45]

---

[44] Ond pwy yw'r marchog? Pam mae'n drist ei wedd?
Paham y gwisga'i harddwch lwydni'r bedd? p. 6.

[45] Trystan, gad dy rwyfo;
Ac eistedd yma ennyd i orffwyso.
Cei adrodd imi hanes serch Gwenhwyfar
A Lanselot, eim harchog dewr digymar. p. 38.

So Trystan comes and sits at her feet. The details of her wooing may be passed over, but finally he asks for a drink. She searches in vain for wine until finally she finds a golden flask in the bosom of Branwen. She dances lightly back again[46] and offers Trystan the drink in a golden cup, but he suggests that they both drink from it at the same time. As they do so a shudder runs through them, for the wine is a love potion brewed by Esyllt's mother and given to Branwen to keep against Esyllt's wedding day. Part IV. Esyllt has given March her hand but not her heart. Soon, at the instigation of Meiriadog, Trystan is banished from court and forced to live in a cave in the woods with only his horse, his sword, and his harp for company. A brook came out of the woods and flowed by the door of Esyllt's home, and regularly every day Trystan sent her flowers by this means.[47] One day a knight from Ireland, a former lover of Esyllt's, appeared at March's court. He was a wonderful fiddler but he refused to play until March promised to give him as a reward anything he might ask. The next morning he named as his reward Esyllt, and as March could not go back on his word the knight led her away. But Trystan who had heard about it all came up just as they were sailing, and Esyllt persuaded the knight to return to take the supposed minstrel with them. As soon as the vessel landed Trystan seized Esyllt and bore her away to his cave in the woods; there they lived for some time until their hiding-place was discovered and Esyllt was brought home and Trystan forced to flee with a price on his head. Part V. Trystan, now in Brittany, is singing of Esyllt, and Esyllt of the White Hands thinks that the song refers to her; when her father offers her as wife to Trystan the latter is afraid to refuse. He soon falls sick and sends his squire Dyfnant to Cornwall for Esyllt, bidding him hoist a white sail if she returns with him and a black one if she does not. His wife Esyllt hears of the plan, and when he asks her the color of the returning sail she says

[46] Ar ysgafn droed hi ddawnsiai'n ôl yn llawen. p. 42.

[47] Bob dydd cyn wired ag fod dydd yn dyfod,
Doi blodau gyda'r dwr at drws yr hafod. p. 50.

"black." He dies of grief, and Esyllt of Ireland comes in only to fall on his body and die also.

To my mind a much better poem on the same subject is the one by Mr. W. J. Gruffydd.[48] It is written in blank verse, which, while it never has in Welsh quite the dignity that it sometimes does in English, is not unsuitable for a serious poem. The author has wisely simplified his material by leaving out a great deal of the early history of Trystan, while the remainder Trystan himself tells, so that the whole time actually occupied by the poem is but a single night.

> Trystan lies sick within his castle in Brittany, with his wife Esyllt of Brittany watching over him while overhead a sentry paces back and forth looking anxiously for an expected sail. Trystan in his delirium begins to live over again his past life: the voyage from Ireland upon which he and the first Esyllt had drunk together the love-draught which on a sudden changed her hatred into love; the night before Esyllt's marriage which he spent with her after killing the sentinel who guarded the house, thus making necessary the substitution of Branwen for her on the wedding night; his forced flight to Brittany where he married the second Esyllt that he might have flesh to clothe the soul of his dreams,[49] and finally his delirium in which he imagined himself leaving this wife and dwelling for a time in a far-off land with the first Esyllt. His wife is so angered by this revelation of his feelings toward her that, when the watchman comes in to announce that a vessel is approaching, she tells Trystan that the sail it bears is black and taunts him with his vain hope that his former love would give up her station in Cornwall and come to him. Trystan dies of his grief and Esyllt of Ireland, who really has come, enters soon afterward, falls upon his body, and expires.

The last section of this poem has been translated into English blank verse by Mr. H. Idris Bell;[50] from his translation the person ignorant of Welsh may get a fairly accurate idea of the character of the whole poem.

The next Arthurian poem to receive a prize at a National

---

[48] W. J. Gruffydd. *Caneuon a Cherddi.* Bangor, 1906., p. 75.

[49] "cnawd i wisgo enaid fy mreuddwydion." P. 98.

[50] *Poems from the Welsh.* Carnarvon, 1913. P. 61.

Eisteddfod is the *Geraint and Enid* (*Geraint ac Enid*) of Machreth (J. Machreth Rees).[51] In subject matter it follows so closely the version given in Lady Guest's *Mabinogion* that it is unnecessary to say much about it: Part I begins just before Geraint gets to the town—he tells to Ynywl what had led up to his journey—and ends when Geraint and Enid are received at court; Part II begins with Geraint, after three years of married life, neglecting his warlike exercises, and ends with the recovery of Geraint from his swoon and the killing of Limwris.

The poem is written in the strict metres, as is required in one submitted in competition for the Chair, and, if it is permissible in one for whom Welsh is an acquired language to express an opinion on a point of Welsh metrics, I should say that herein lies its chief weakness. When composing in the strict metres one must pay so much attention to the form that often the spirit is sacrificed. This is particularly likely to happen in the "englyn" which is the most elaborate and artificial of all the twenty-four metres. Mr. Gwynn Jones seems to realize this danger and in *The Departure of Arthur* he uses chiefly the simpler forms, and employs the englyn very sparingly, but Machreth in *Geraint and Enid* uses it, and forms similar to it, very frequently. The result is that, although the reader may be filled with admiration for the author's mastery of the technical details of his craft, he finds it difficult to get into the spirit of the story and he longs for the simplicity of the *Mabinogion* version.

Of the eight competitors for the crown in 1907 some merely retold in Welsh verse stories that were much better in the original prose versions; others cast aside the old stories entirely and wrote simply sermons or essays in moral philosophy crammed full of abstract terms from beginning to end.[52] The winner, who proved to be Dyfnallt (John Dyfnallt Owen),[53] avoided both of these extremes. His characters exhibit something of a tendency toward rhetorical speeches but the plot, composed largely of incidents taken from Malory (Books XIII–XVII), is one that is not far from the spirit of some of the old Grail romances.

---

[51] *Geraint ac Enid a Chaniadau Eraill gan Machreth.* Liverpool, 1908. It had previously been published in *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Eisteddfod Genedlaethol 1904* (*Rhyl*)., p. 21.

[52] Adjudication of Hawen (David Adams) in *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Eisteddfod Genedlaethol 1907* (*Abertawe*). London, 1908., p. 48.

[53] *Pryddest*: "*Y Greal Santaidd.*" in *Cofnodion . . . 1907.*, p. 61.

The poem begins (after a brief introduction) with the assembling of the knights at Eastertime in Arthur's court. Kai, Gwalchmai, Peredur, and Lawnslot each has a story to tell of some marvel he has seen or heard while on his journey. Then Galahad, "The Red Knight," arrives at the court and preaches the Grail Quest to them. One test after another proves his fitness to lead this enterprise: his forgetfulness of self is shown by his sitting in the Siege Perilous (Eisteddfa Beryglus); his strength by drawing a sword from a stone in the river after all the other good knights had failed; his courage by his conduct in the tournament in which he wins the victory. Finally a mystic light accompanied by thunder fills the hall in which all the knights are at meat and all take this as a sign that the Quest should begin.

The knights ride forth from Camelot amid general mourning on the part of those left behind. Galahad is leading and one after another the rest turn aside as the fancy strikes them, until finally he is left alone. He comes to the Castle of the Maidens and frees them from their oppression. Meanwhile Gwalchmai has been riding onward, his mind full of worldly things. He curses himself for his folly in taking the rash oath of a Quester. As he passes by the cell of a hermit the latter comes out and, as though reading Gwalchmai's mind, rebukes him for his interest in the world and exhorts him to seek spiritual things. Lawnslot, too, soon tires of an enterprise which he had undertaken out of love for Gwenhwyfar rather than from religious motives and he longs to be back with her again. Finally a realization of his sin comes to him and just at this time he meets a hermit who explains that because of his unlawful love the Grail has remained hidden from him. He meets Galahad who sails with him for some months but at the bidding of the mystic voice leaves him again. Lawnslot alone in a boat at the mercy of wind and waves prays night and day that he may have a vision of the Grail.

He arrives at the Grail Castle but when, not yet purged of his pride, he attempts to stride into the sacred chamber he is met by a whirlwind that strikes him powerless to the floor and the vision is hidden from him. Peredur has been sustained during his wanderings by the prophecy that he should be one of the three knights to finish the Quest, but after he has climbed to the summit of the Mount of Vision he begins to doubt his power. Galahad meets him and cheers him and they ride on together until they meet Bwrt. Bwrt tells them that he has met Lawnslot returning to his old life; he himself was sorely tempted by the delights of the flesh but managed to overcome them. The three reach the Temple of the Grail and Galahad, the object of his whole life now accomplished, prepares to die. To Peredur he gives his sword and to Bwrt his shield and sends them back to tell his friends that he has passed through the veil that separates this life from the life eternal.

Of the poems produced without the stimulus of a prize contest a considerable number deal with the expected return of Arthur to aid his people in the day when their need shall be greatest.[54] In most cases this takes the form of the legend of Arthur and his men sleeping in a cave until the day comes, a belief which has persisted as folk-lore down to the present day in many parts of Wales.[55] The most ambitious work on this subject is the *Dyfodiad Arthur* (*The Coming of Arthur*)[56] of the late Robert Bryan, which the author calls an "operetta libretto on a Welsh subject (Libretto Operetta ar Neges Cymru)." There are five solo parts, a chorus of men—the knights, and a full chorus—the Welsh People. A good idea of the story of the piece may be obtained from the summary which the author prefixes to it.

---

[54] This theme has become associated also with the Nationalist and Pan-Celtic movements in Brittany. As early as 1859 François-Marie Luzel in the preface to *Bepred Breizad* (*Always Breton*) wrote, "Did the old Bards lie to us when they prophesied the resurrection of Arthur? No, Arthur shall yet reappear in the midst of his faithful Bretons and the old Celtic spirit will be reborn," while Édouard Beaufils calls upon Merlin to hear the cry of distressed Brittany and to arise—to keep the French from building a railroad between Guingamp and Tréguier. Of the twenty-seven poems containing Arthurian references which are included in Le Mercier d'Erm's collection of Breton nationalist poetry of the 19th and 20th Centuries, fourteen make use of the theme of the expected return of Arzur (Arthur), and often of Marzin (Merlin) as well, to free Brittany from the yoke of the French. The editor himself says in his preface, "Quant à moi, s'il doit nous naître, un jour, un O'Connel ou un Mazarik—et il nous naîtra!—et si Arthur— qui n'est pas mort—doit se manifester à ses fidèles sous quelque nouvel avatar, mon ambition et ma fonction auront été d'être un peu comme le *Précurseur* de ce Messie des Bretons."

[55] Sir John Rhŷs has collected a number of versions of this legend in Chapter VIII of his *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*.

> "SCENE I. THE VIGIL. The Welsh people, remembering the afflictions of the past and longing for the dawning of the day when Arthur and his knights shall come.
>
> SCENE II. THE CAVE. Arthur and his armed knights sleeping. A Covetous Man intrudes into the cave and the bell of the watchman rings. The knights arise and ask, 'Has the day come?' The watchman replies that some one in search of riches is there. Arthur drives him away to be punished and bids the host sleep for the day has not come. Then an Ambitious Man comes in and the bell rings a second time. The knights awake again and ask, 'Has the day come?' No, the day has not dawned; this man loves selfish glory (hunanglod). Away with him to his fate, and the knights sleep again. Then a Patriot appears and the bell rings a third time. The knights rise up and the watchman announces that the day is dawning. Arthur calls for the Patriot, and having heard his message the host starts out into the world with the light of the long-expected day shining on their arms.
>
> SCENE III. THE DAWNING OF THE DAY. The Welsh people rejoicing at the dawning of the day. King Arthur and his knights are seen marching with the dawn on the eastern hills. They are greeted by the Welsh, and the heroes of Old Wales and Modern Wales (Cymru Fu a Chymru Sydd) join in a song of triumph on the dawning of a new day in the history of the world."[57]

[56] Robert Bryan. *Tua'r Wawr*. Liverpool, 1921., pp. 22-32. It was written first in English for a musical festival (see the author's letter to Sir Owen M. Edwards concerning it in *Cymru*, Number 352, p. 144), was apparently never published, and was then rewritten in Welsh by the original author, and was published in *Cymru*, No. 352, p. 146, before appearing in Bryan's collected works.

[57] Another play on the same subject, *Y Deffroad* (*The Awakening*) by Griffith R. Jones, I have not seen; it is written for children's schools.

Another poem on the same subject is the *Ogof Arthur* (*Arthur's Cave*)[58] of Mr. T. Gwynn Jones, the fourth of his *Songs of Yesterday* (*Cerddi Doe*); it follows very closely the popular version of the story found in Glamorgan by Iolo Morgannwg.[59]

> A Welshman walking one day in London is stopped by an old man who asks him where he cut the ash wand which he carries in his hand, and tells him that beneath that spot is a great cave in which sleep Arthur and his men. The cave contains a great treasure but in its entrance is a bell which, when touched, will give forth a sound that will awaken the warriors. Arthur will start up and ask, "Is it day?" and if one answers "Sleep, the time has not come," they will sink back again, but when one comes and answers, "Arise, the day comes," they will all rise up and Britain shall yet be free. The Welshman went to the spot indicated and found everything as the old man had said; as he was carrying away a load of the treasure he touched the bell which sounded loudly, but to Arthur's question he answered, "Sleep, the time has not come," and the knights all sank back to sleep. Many a time after that the man sought for the cave but never found it again.

Very much the same story is told by J. Spinther James in his *Ogof Arthur Gawr* (*Giant Arthur's Cave*)[60] except that Einion hears of the cave from a witch whom he meets in the hills of Wales. Other poems which tell the same story but omit some of the details are *Arthur Gyda Ni* (*Arthur with us*)[61] by Elfed (Howell Elvet Lewis), and *Arthur yn Cyfodi* (*Arthur arising*)[62] by R. Silyn Roberts. Still others who treat more briefly of the same subject, usually with the emphasis on the expected return of Arthur are Gwmryn (Gwmryn Jones) in *Codi Baner Cymry*,[63]

---

[58] T. G. Jones. *Ymadawiad Arthur.*, p. 95.

[59] J. Rhŷs. *Celtic Folklore.* II, 485. A very closely related version of the story (taken from *Llyfrau Ystraeon Hanes* by Owen M. Edwards) has been used by Mr. Ernest Rhys for his English poem *King Arthur's Sleep.* (*Welsh Ballads*, p.20).

[60] *Cyfaill yr Adroddwr.* Wrexham, 1910., p. 60.

[61] *Caniadau Elfed.* Cardiff, [1909]., p. 94.

[62] *Telynegion gan R. Silyn Roberts a W. J. Gruffydd.* Bangor, 1900, p. 78. Reprinted in *Trystan ac Esyllt*, p. 125.

[63] *Gemau Ceredigion.* Cardiff, n.d. II, 63.

T. E. Nicholas in *Gymru Annwyl, Cwyd dy Galon,*[64] D. R. Jones in *Gobaith Cymru,*[65] Eifion Wyn (Eliseus Williams) in *Coelcerthi'r Bannau*[66] and Machreth in *Dychweliad Arthur.*[67]

A somewhat different treatment of the same materials is to be found in *Yr Awrhon a Chynt* (*Now and Formerly*)[68] by Index (David Rhys Williams), who has lived in the United States since 1883. The poem is wholly humorous in tone but back of the humor the author seems to have had a serious purpose; like other writers who use the Arthur story he attempts to appeal to the feeling of Welsh nationality, but he is interested also in other problems of the day and he fits a discussion of them into the framework of his story.

> The poet dreams that he discovers Arthur's Cave and the watchman leads him through the midst of the host to the monarch's presence where a stool is placed for him and he sits and converses with the king. The mention of Medrawd's rebellion causes the poet to remark that such a lack of unity had been the curse of their race throughout the ages, and to regret that Arthur could not come back to earth to annihilate the Dicshondafydds[69] and other enemies of the Welsh people. His inquiry as to Arthur's wound and the physician who tended him leads to a comparison between the simple living of the older time which needed no doctors, and our modern life which places so much reliance upon them that it is a wonder that any of us survive. Arthur is much heartened to hear that in spite of everything the Welsh people are still prospering, for he has had no news of the outside world, being without either telephone connections or newspapers. At this point Gwenhwyfar comes into the room and is introduced—"This is my wife! A friend from Wales! (Dyma'm cydwedd! Car o Gymru!)"—and the talk drifts to modern education, the modern woman who

---

[64] *Salmau'r Werin.* Second Edition. Wrexham, 1913, p. 78.

[65] *Cyfaill yr Adroddwr.* p. 30.

[66] *Telynegion Maes a Mor.* Second Edition. Cardiff, [1908]. p. 110.

[67] *Geraint ac Enid.* p. 81.

[68] *Am Dro i Erstalwm.* Utica, N. Y., [n.d.] pp. 97-125. In the same volume, pp.50-62, is a discussion of some of the versions of the Arthur story.

[69] Welshmen who are ashamed of their nationality; so called from the poem of Glan y Gors (John Jones) which may be found on page 51 of *Gwaith Glan y Gors*, Llanuwchllyn, [1905].

> rides astride and is learning to spit like a man, the wonders of modern science, and finally to religion. The poet is rather bitter over the pretensions of the Catholic Church to have a monopoly of divine grace, and Arthur and Gwenhwyfar agree with him that the faith professed by the Welsh people is by far the best. He is invited to remain over night, and the next morning, after having been shown over the whole palace, he is sent back to earth with the best wishes of both the king and the queen for his people.

Next in popularity as a source for Arthurian poems is the story of Kilhwch and Olwen included by Lady Guest in her *Mabinogion*. The *Cilhwch ac Olwen*[70] of Elphin (Robert A. Griffith) is a somewhat impressionistic retelling of this story.

> Cilhwch ab Cilydd, a noble young warrior, had no thought of love until one day he met a witch who warned him to love while he was young. Meanwhile Olwen, the beautiful daughter of Ysbyddaden Gawr the bitterest of Arthur's enemies, is living a lonely life. Cilhwch rides by followed by Cai, Bedwyr, Gwalchmai, Sandde Bryd Angel, Trystan, and Rhun. Cilhwch falls in love with Olwen, and with the help of the six other knights he fights his way into the presence of her father. Ysbyddaden lays upon him certain seemingly impossible tasks that he must perform before he can win Olwen. He rides away and she waits lonely for him, but at last he returns with all the feats accomplished and takes her away with him.

The *Olwen*[70a] of Bryfdir (Humphrey Jones) tells very much the same story, dwelling upon the descriptions of Cilhwch and Olwen as the Mabinogion does; the various tasks which play so important a part in that version are left out, and instead we get a certain amount of sentimentality that was unknown to the old story-teller. In places where the author has followed closely the Mabinogion it would seem that he has used Lady Guest's

---

[70] This poem was awarded one of the lesser prizes at the National Eisteddfod held at Merthyr Tydfil in 1901. It was printed in *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Eisteddfod Genedlaethol, 1901* (p. 82), and reprinted in Elphin's *O Fôr i Fynydd a Chaniadau Ereill*. Liverpool, 1909. (p. 27.)

[70a] This was awarded the prize for a rhieingerdd at the National Eisteddfod at Neath in 1918. It is published in *Cofnodion a Chyfansoddiadau Eisteddfod Genedlaethol 1918* (*Castell Nedd*). London, 1919. p. 119.

,translation rather than the original Welsh. For instance, the Red Book "a llugorn eliffeint yndi" she renders "his war-horn was of ivory" (Loth refers this to the sword and translates "dans la croix était une lanterne d'ivoire"), and Bryfdir has "Teg ifori oedd ei udgorn"; the Red Book "Os ar dy gam y doethost mywn. dos ar dy redec allan" she translates, "If walking thou didst enter here, return thou running," and Bryfdir has, in a slightly different construction, "Tan gerdded daethai'r porthor, tan redeg aeth yn ol"; the Red Book "Pedeir meillonen gwynnyon. a uydei yn y hol pa fford bynnac y delhei" is given by Lady Guest as "Four white trefoils sprung up wherever she trod," and by Bryfdir as " 'Roedd pedair o feillion claerwynion yn tyfu lle sangai ei throed," losing completely the play on the name Olwen. In other places however he approaches the original more closely in his choice of words.

Certain incidents of this story are taken by other poets as the subjects of poems such as the *Hela'r Twrch Trwyth*[71] of G. ap Lleision (W. Griffiths), which tells the story of the hunting of the Twrch Trwyth, and *Y Morgrug*[72] by Sir John Morris Jones, which relates how the ants recovered the flax-seed demanded by Ysbaddaden Gawr, but the feature of the story that seems to have appealed most to the poets is the picture of the fair Olwen in whose foot-steps white clovers sprang up. Sometimes she is used simply to bring out the beauty of the poet's own love as in the *Fy Olwen i* (*My Olwen*)[73] of Crwys (W. Crwys Williams), but more often she becomes a symbol of Springtime as in the *Dewiniaeth Olwen* (*The magic of Olwen*)[74] of Elfed or the *Mabinogi*[75] of Eifion Wyn. References to one or the other of these characteristics of Olwen are so numerous in Welsh poetry that it is idle to attempt to make a list of them.[76]

---

[71] *Cerddi'r Mynydd Du.* Aberhonddu, 1913. P. 21.

[72] *Caniadau.* Oxford, 1907. P. 21.

[73] *Cerddi Crwys.* Llanelli, 1920. P. 49.

[74] *Caniadau Elfed.* P. 54.

[75] *Telynegion Maes a Mor.* P. 85.

[76] This type of poem is well illustrated by the *Olwen* of Sarnicol (Jacob T. Thomas) which is written in English but is very likely to escape the English reader since it is published in the midst of a volume of Welsh poems. *Odlau Môr a Mynydd.* Abergavenny [1912], p. 94.

The *Gareth ac Eluned* (*Gareth and Lynette*)[77] of Pedr Alaw (Peter Edwards), a musical play intended for school children, is worthy of comment as showing the Welsh interest in this story that became attached to the Arthurian cycle, but it is too well adapted to its purpose to deserve extended consideration here. Mention should be made also of the *O Ffarwel, fy Arthur Fawr* (*O farewell my great Arthur*)[78] of Ceiriog (John Ceiriog Hughes), "Written after reading the Gwenhwyfar of Llew Llwyfo," and the *Molawd Arthur, sef Can y Frenhines* (*The praise of Arthur, or the song of the Queen*)[79] by R. J. Derfel, but a much better poem than either of them is the *Arthur Gawr* (*Arthur the Giant*)[80] which is number three in the *Songs of Yesterday* of Mr. T. Gwynn Jones. This is a spirited ballad, full of color, describing the assembling of the lords of Britain to select a successor to Uther Bendragon, their failure to agree, and the suggestion of Myrddin that they pray for guidance. The next morning, there in the public square they found an anvil with a sword stuck through it, and on the stone beneath was written in letters of gold, "He who pulls the sword out of the middle of the steel shall be king of the island."[81] No one could accomplish this feat except Arthur, and he was accordingly chosen king.[82]

In one respect the Welsh Arthurian stories are different from those of any other nation in modern times. For all the others Arthur is a purely imaginary person, good as the subject for a romantic story but having absolutely no connection with modern life and not to be taken seriously. The Welshman, however, does take him seriously. For the simple peasant Arthur still sleeps in the midst of his men in some remote cavern in the Welsh hills, while for some, though not all, of the writers the return of Arthur has become symbolic of the future in store for the Cymric race. Sir John Morris Jones in the preface to *Gwlad fy Nhadau* (*The Land of my Fathers*),[83] a book of selections from Welsh literature and art published during the war for the Welsh troops, says, "Surely it will be noticed how appropriate to the present occasion are many of the pieces that relate to the patriotic tradition of the Welsh; the reason is that this conflict is the old one—between the spirit of the Celt and the spirit of the Teuton. Britain is throughout more Celtic than was formerly thought, and to-day is fighting the battle of the Celt for freedom and civilization against the military arrogance and barbarism of the Teuton. (brwydr y Celt dros ryddid a gwareiddiad yn erbyn traha milwrol ac anwariaeth y Teuton.)" Among the selections printed in this book we find Eifion Wyn's *Coelcerthi'r Bannau* in which occur the lines

---

[77] Wrexham, 1911. Another book prepared for school children is *Y Seint Greal* by J. M. Edwards (Cardiff n.d.) a reader based on the Grail stories in the Peniarth and Mostyn manuscripts.

[78] First published in *Oriau'r Bore* in 1862. In the collected edition of Ceiriog's Works (Third Edition, Wrexham, 1911) it is printed on page 65 of the second section of the first volume.

[79] *Cerddi Cymru.* Carnarvon, n.d. I, 210.

[80] *Ymadawiad Arthur.* P. 90.

[81] A dynno'r cledd o ganol y dur
A fydd ar yr ynys ri.

[82] In this paper I have not taken into consideration poems such as the *Myrddin Wyllt* and the *Arthur Llewelyn* of Glasynys (Owen Wynne Jones) or the *Derwen Arthur* of Machreth which make use of certain Arthurian names, but belong to quite different traditions; neither have I made any attempt to make a collection of all the brief references to Arthurian subjects. There is also a cantata *Llys Arthur* (*Arthur's Court*) by Joseph David Jones which I have not seen. See *Eminent Welshmen*, p. 261.

> Shall the stranger have a road he can travel
> Shall our castles fall?
> What are you doing in the cavern,
> Idle host of Arthur the Great?[84]

and Elfed's *Arthur Gyda Ni* which reads when translated:

> Arthur the Great is sleeping
> And his warriors who are around him
> Grasping their swords:
> When day shall come in Wales,
> Arthur the Great shall rise up
> Alive—alive from his grave!
>
> When the land of men shall arise
> To battle true-heartedly
> On the side of heaven and man,

---

[83] *Gwlad fy Nhadau; Rhodd Cymru i'w Byddin.* London, [1915].

[84] Gaiff yr allfro ffordd yr elo
Gwympo'n cestyll hyd y llawr?
Beth a wnewch chwi yn yr ogof,
Fintai segur Arthur Fawr? *Gwlad fy Nhadau.* P. 115.

This poem is found also in *Telynegion Maes a Mor*, p. 110.

The undying ages shall come
To stand beside them—
To stand unshaken.

When the land shall be ready,
And greater purity be the custom,
Arthur shall be with us:
Where the polished heart is found,
There shall be found the Holy Grail,
And man in honor.[55]

as well as Dyfed's (Evan Rees) rather prosaic *Saf i fyny dros dy Wlad* (*Stand up for your Country*) in which occur the lines

Remember Glendower and Llewelyn
And the knights of Arthur the great;
And in the face of the surly enemy,
Put your foot down hard.[56]

All of these poems, I believe, were selected by the editors in accordance with the thought already quoted from the preface to the book.[87]

---

[55] Mae Arthur Fawr yn cysgu,
A'i ddewrion sydd o'i ddeutu
  A'u gafael ar y cledd:
Pan ddaw yn ddydd yng Nghymru,
Daw Arthur Fawr i fyny
  Yn fyw—yn fyw o'i fedd!

Pan ddeffry gwlad o ddynion
I frwydro'n gywir-galon
  O blaid y nef a dyn,
Daw anfarwolion oesau
I sefyll wrth ei hochrau—
  I sefyll yn ddi-gryn.

Pan fydd y wlad yn barod,
A glendid mwy yn ddefod,
  Bydd Arthur gyda ni:
Lle ceir y galon lathraidd,
Fe geir y Greal Santaidd,
  Ac fe geir dyn mewn bri. *Gwlad fy Nhadau*. pp. 5-6.

Printed also in *Caniadau Elfed*, p. 94.

[56] Cofia Lyndŵr a Llywelyn,
  A marchogion Arthur fawr;
Ac yn wyneb sarrug elyn,
  Rho dy droed yn drwm i lawr.
Gwlad fy Nhadau, p. 114.

Mention has already been made of Robert Bryan's *Dyfodiad Arthur.* This was written before the war but its author evidently intended it to be symbolic, for in 1920 he writes concerning it, "You will see how close I was to prophesying the influence of Wales upon the world through our Prime Minister. (Gwelwch mor agos a fum i broffwydo dylanwad Cymru ar y byd trwy ein Prif Weinidog.)"[88] Finally one must not overlook the *Wedi'r Frwydr* (*After the Conflict*) written in the midst of the great war by that promising young poet Hedd Wyn (Ellis H. Evans), private in the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, B. E. F., who soon afterwards lost his life in this great conflict "somewhere in France":—

In the day of the battle thou shalt become as an old man,
  And thy long hair the color of the foam on the wave;
Behind thee shall be the days of the battle and their troubles
  Before thee the blue sea with its peaceful bosom;
Thou shalt see on the crests of the waves
The ships of the maidens from the beautiful shores
  Coming to take thee like Arthur of old
Over each blue wave there to Avalon,
The war-less isle of the immortals,
  The island of green trees and melodious winds;
There shall be forgetfulness of thy deep wounds;
There shalt thou have the joy of the hall of the Pendragon;
  And thou shalt dwell forever in the Isle of the Dawn,
  The island whose ramparts are the blue sea.[89]

---

[87] Another poem that might well have been included in the book is Eifion Wyn's *Ochain y Clwyfawg* (*The groaning of the Wounded*) in which the dying soldier sends home word "that I died like Arthur and the men of the Round Table of old—my face to the banner, and my wounds in my breast." *Telynegion Maes a Mor.* P. 114.

[88] Letter to Sir Owen M. Edwards, dated 25/IV/20. *Cymru*, Number 352, p. 144.

[89]
Yn nydd y frwydr cei droi'n hynafgwr,
  A'th hirwallt un liw ewyn y don;
O'th ôl bydd dyddiau'r frwydr a'u cynnwr'
  O'th flaen bydd glasfor tawel ei fron;
Dithau a weli ar frig y tonnau
Fadau rhianedd y teg ororau
  Yn dod i'th gyrchu fel Arthur gynt
Dros fin pob glasdon draw i Afallon,

When a simple shepherd lad, taken from his father's farm among the Welsh hills and brought face to face with death in the trenches of Flanders, thus uses the Arthur story for the concluding stanza of one of his most thoughtful poems, surely he does not look upon it as an idle fiction; rather is it for him, as for so many of his countrymen, a symbol of all the hopes and the longings of the Celtic race.

John J. Parry

University of Illinois

Ynys ddi frwydrau yr anfarwolion,
  Ynys dan lasgoed a cherddgar wynt;
Yno bydd angof dy glwyfau dyfnion;
Yno cei londer Llys y Pendragon;
  A thrigi fyth yn Ynys y Wawrddydd,
  Ynys a'r glasfor iddi yn geyrydd.

Cerddi'r Bugail, Cyfrol Goffa Hedd Wyn. Cardiff, 1918. P. 145.

Supplementary Note. The Arthurian Story is to receive recognition again at the Eisteddfod to be held at Mold next summer; among the subjects recently announced is "The Return of Arthur," (Dychweliad Arthur), which is assigned as the subject of the ode to be presented in competition for the chair.

DIE RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE BEDEUTUNG DER ÄLTESTEN RUNENINSCHRIFTEN

Während man bis vor nicht langer Zeit glaubte, der Norden Europas habe, ehe das römische Reich seine Fangarme nach ihm ausstreckte, ein von der übrigen Kulturwelt isoliertes Dasein geführt, wissen wir jetzt, dass das niemals der Fall war, seit man vom Aufblühen der menschlichen Kultur reden kann. Handelsverbindungen zwischen Nord-und Südeuropa bestanden schon in fernen vorgeschichtlichen Perioden.[1] Nordische Produkte wie der Bernstein finden sich bereits in den Gräbern der mykenischen Zeit in Griechenland, und fremde Erzeugnisse wie die Bronze wurden dafür nach dem Norden eingeführt. Aber nicht nur materielle Güter wanderten auf uns nur teilweise bekannten wegen von Volk zu volk, auch geistige Anregungen verbreiteten sich schon in undenklicher Vorzeit im Gefolge der Handelsbeziehungen und kriegerischen Eroberungen. Wir wissen, dass sich lange, bevor das Licht der Geschichte über Europa dämmerte, die Ausbreitung der indogermanischen Sprachen vollzog; aber auch religiöse Vorstellungen wanderten schon vor Jahrtausenden über weite Strecken, wie in geschichtlicher Zeit die Weltreligionen des Buddhismus, des Christentums und des Islam. Der prähistorische Kult des Sonnenrads, der sich vom Orient aus bis nach Nordeuropa verbreitete und zum christlichen Kreuz umgestaltet noch heute fortlebt[2]; die Doppelaxt als heiliges Symbol, das wir von dem minoischen Kreta bis in die jüngste heidnische Zeit Nordeuropas verfolgen können (Thorshammer),[3] sind Beispiele für die Wanderungen religiöser Symbole. Die in den verschiedenen prähistorischen Perioden abwechselnde Erdbestattung und Verbrennung der Toten zeigt, dass sich die Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode änderten und, wie die wandernden Begräbnisriten beweisen, von Volk zu Volk verbreiteten. Ein schwedischer Forscher hat in den letzten Jahren die Ansicht vertreten, dass die nordischen Felszeichnungen Symbole eines Totenkultes sind, der von Aegypten ausgehend sich schon in der jüngeren Steinzeit nach Nordeuropa verbreitet hat.[4] Gewisse Darstellungen auf schwedischen Felswänden stimmen auffallend zu Szenen aus dem ägyptischen Totenbuch. Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass sich auch der sprachliche Niederschlag dieser religiösen Vorstellungen aufspüren lässt. Wenn die Zwerge in Strophe 14 der Vǫlospǭ durch sumpfige Täler "til **jǫrovalla** "ziehen, so wird das dunkle Wort **jǫrovǫllr** entweder[5] als "Sandfeld" oder[6] als "Kampfebene" gedeutet (daneben findet sich übrigens ein mit dem gleichen ersten Bestandteil **jǫru**-zusammengesetztes **jǫruskōgr** "Joruwald" in dem Vers 1 des Stjornu-Odda draumr[7]; zu deuten als "Sandwald"?) Offenbar steht der **jǫrovǫllr** in einem Gegensatz zu dem **iþavǫllr,** wo sich die Götter treffen, von ebenfalls unsicherer Bedeutung. Vermutlich haben wir sowohl in **jǫro**—wie **iþa**-höchst altertümliche, vielleicht prägermanische Bestandteile zu erblicken. Darf man bei dem Versammlungsplatz der Götter an eine Art 'Ηλύσιον πεδίον nach griechisch—homerisch—minvischer (?) Vorstellung denken, so wird man bei den Zwergen, die doch chthonische Wesen sind, einen Ort der Unterwelt als Treffpunkt annehmen müssen. Da bietet sich nun zur Deutung von **joro**-der Name des Feldes **Earu** aus dem ägyptischen Totenglauben (eig. Binsenfeld?), zu dem man über die umgebenden Gewässer (vgl. die sumpfigen Täler in der Vǫlospǭ) auf einem Kahn gelangt[8]). Sollte der Name nicht mit der Vorstellung von dem Jenseitsdasein nach dem Norden gekommen sein?

---

[1] O. Montelius, Der Handel in der Vorzeit. Prähist. Zs. 2, 249 ff.

[2] Ders. Das Rad als religiöses Symbol in vorchristlicher und christlicher Zeit. Prometheus 16, Nr. 16-18 u. Mannus 1, 53 ff.

[3] R. Dussaud, Les Civilisations prehelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Égée, 2 éd. p. 329 ff. Sophus Müller, Urgeschichte Europas, S. 59 f. f. O. Montelius, Kulturgeschichte Schwedens, 55 f.

Denn gerade die von Ägypten ausgehenden Vorstellungen von dem Leben nach dem Tode scheinen im Norden am nachhaltigsten gewirkt zu haben. Die "Bootfahrt ins Jenseits"[9] ist ein Glaubenssatz geworden, der vom Ende der jüngern Bronzezeit mit Unterbrechungen bis zur Wikingerzeit fortlebte. Auf der schwedischen Insel Gotland findet sich eine grosse Anzahl schiffsförmiger Steinsetzungen um die Gräber, die in Verbindung mit den häufigen Schiffsbildern auf Grabplatten und auf den Felsenritzungen keinen Zweifel über einen schon damals herrschenden Totenglauben, nach dem man zu Schiff in das Jenseits gelangt, lassen können. Seine glänzendste Ausgestaltung aber findet er viele Jahrhunderte später zur Wikingerzeit, wenn der verstorbene Häuptling entweder mit seinem Boot bestattet oder in ihm auf der See verbrannt wird.

---

[4] G. Eckholm, De skandinaviska hällristingarna och deras Betydelse. Ymer 1916, 275 ff.

[5] Nach K. Müllenhoff, Deutsche Altertumskunde, Bd. 5, 93.

[6] Sv. Egilsson, Lexicon poëticum ed. F. Jónsson, S. 330.

[7] ebenda.

[8] A. Erman, Die ägyptische Religion, S. 93 ff.

[9] M. Ebert, Die Bootfahrt ins Jenseits. Prähist. Zs. 12, 179 ff.

Aber auch abgesehen von den Jenseitsvorstellung ist der germanische Glaube von orientalischen Einflüssen nicht frei geblieben. *G. Neckel* hat in einem vor 2 Jahren erschienenen Buch den Versuch gemacht,[10] die Gestalt des Gottes Balder aus dem Bild des phrygischen Gottes Attis herzuleiten, der selbst mit dem babylonischen Tamûz identisch ist und in dem griechischen Dionysos eine uns vertrautere Widerspiegelung gefunden hat. Er durfte sich dabei auf das Zeugnis von *Axel Olrik*, des berühmten nordischen Sagen-und Religionsforschers, sowie von Gudmund Schütte, des bekannten Altertumsforschers, stützen, die ebenfalls an frühe Beeinflussung des germanischen Glaubens durch orientalische Vorstellungen glauben, worauf in einem gleich zu erwähnenden Aufsatz *Neckels* hingewiesen wird.

Dieser im Jahre 1921 erschienene Aufsatz ist für den in der vorliegenden Abhandlung verfolgten Zweck ganz besonders interessant, weil *G. Neckel* die auf dem Goldhorn von Gallehus aufgelöteten Menschenfiguren als Götter orientalischen Ursprungs zu deuten versucht.[11] Dieses Horn trägt aber bekanntlich eine der ältesten Runeninschriften, auf die wir im Folgenden noch zu sprechen kommen werden. Mögen wir diesen Deutungen immerhin einige Skepsis entgegenbringen—zumal die anderen eingeritzten Bilder auf näherliegende Vorbilder römischer Herkunft zurückgehen[12]—die Tatsache, dass ein solcher Versuch von einem so gründlichen Kenner germanischer Religiongeschichte unternommen werden konnte, spricht für die in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen allmählich durchdringende

---

[10] Die Überlieferungen vom Gotte Balder. 1920.

[11] Die Götter auf dem goldenen Horn, Zs. f.d. Altert. 58, 225 ff.

[12] O. Almgrén, Det runristade guldhornets datering. Namn og Bygd, 2, 217 ff.

Überzeugung von der Bedeutung der Einflüsse des Orients auf die Ausgestaltung der germanischen Religion.

Doch dem sei, wie es wolle, jedenfalls steht das eine fest, dass in verschiedenen Epochen der vorgeschichtlichen Zeit bis zum Beginn der geschichtlichen Periode Nordeuropas, schon vor dem Eindringen des Christentums, religiöse Vorstellungen und wohl auch zugehörige Formeln oder Worte von den Höhenlagen uralter Kultur im vorderen Orient zu den abgelegenen Ländern des Nordens gewandert sind. Eine solche Wanderung religiösen Gutes wollen wir nun auch in den folgenden Zeilen beleuchten.

In vielen urnordischen Runenschriften findet sich eine Formel: "ich (häufig+Name) schrieb die Runen (oder ähnlich)".

Die Inschrift der im Jahre 1910 entdeckten Grabplatte von Hugl[13] lautet: **ek gudija** (oder **gudinga**) **ungandiR ih** . . . "ich Gudja (Gudinga), der zauberfeste, schrieb (zu ergänzen der fehlende Schluss: die Runen),"—oder wenn man **gudja** appellativ und **ungandiR** als Eigennamen fasst, "ich, der Priester UngandiR, schrieb. . . ." Auf dem Lanzenschaft von Kragehul steht: **ek erilaR a(n)sugisalas muha haitega**" ich, (der) Jarl Ansugisals Muha (aisl. Mōe) heisse ich." Auf der Felswand von Valsfjord (Norwegen) ist zu lesen: **ek hagustaldaR þewaR godagas** . . . "ich Hagestolz, der Knecht Gothags, . . . (schrieb die Runen). Das eine der Goldhörner von Gallehus trug um die Trinköffnung die Inschrift: **ek hlewagastiR holtingaR horna tawido** "ich Hlewagastir der Holting (oder aus Holt) machte (d.h. liess anfertigen) das Horn." Auf dem Stein von Einang steht: **dagaR þaR runo faihido** "DagaR schrieb (eig. malte) die Runen." Auch auf dem Kontinent ist die Formel vertreten, wenn die erste Zeile der Freilaubersheimer Spange lautet: **boso wraet runa** "Boso schrieb den Runen (spruch)." Die Beispiele lassen sich noch vermehren, doch genügt das vorgelegte Material für unseren Zweck.

Ich habe schon früher darauf hingewiesen,[14] dass diese Inschriftenmehr besagen als die blosse Mitteilung, wer die Runen angebracht habe. Sie tragen sakralen Charakter und, wie *Mag-*

---

[13] Norges Indskrifter med de ældre Runer, Bd. II 1, 605 ff.

[14] Arkiv för nordisk Filologi 35, 243 ff.

nus Olsen an verschiedenen Stellen[15] nachgewiesen hat, sollen sie einen magischen Zweck erfüllen: Der Tote soll in seiner Grabesruhe vor bösen Geistern geschützt sein; das Grab soll gegen Grabschänder gesichert werden; der Träger eines Schmuckstücks glaubt in dem runenbeschriebenen Gegenstand ein Amulett zu besitzen und dergleichen mehr.

Um eine Zauberwirkung zu erreichen, sind bekanntlich feststehende Formeln nötig, von denen im Wortlaut nicht abgewichen werden darf. Diese Vorstellung ist zu allen Zeiten und bei allen Völkern die gleiche. Die Zauberformeln wandern nicht selten von Volk zu Volk; mit dem Wechsel der Religion werden wohl die Benennungen alter Gottheiten durch neue Namen ersetzt, aber die althergebrachte Form bleibt die Jahrhunderte hindurch erhalten.[16] Soll die Zauberwirkung freilich eine dauernd wirksame sein, so muss die Formel festgehalten werden, indem man sie aufschreibt. Die aufgeschriebene Zauberformel dient dann als Schutzmittel gegen alle dem irdischen (und nachirdischen) Wohle des Menschen feindliche Mächte.[17]

Dieses Ziel suchen auch die Runenmeister durch die Runeninschriften (neben sonstigen magischen Zeichen und Mitteln, über die hier nicht zu sprechen ist) sakralen Charakters und religiöser Form zu erreichen. Die den Runen zugeschriebene Zauberwirkung ist ein Ausfluss des auch schon im Altertum weitverbreiteten Glaubens an Buchstabenzauber,[18] und vielleicht sind die Runen in erster Linie zu solch magischen Zwecken erfunden worden, wie *Magnus Olsen* annimmt. Wir legen uns aber ferner die Frage vor, woher die Ich-Formel, in die der Zauber häufig eingekleidet wird, stammt und auf welchem Weg sie nach dem Norden gekommen ist.

Um diese Frage zu beantworten, wollen wir uns in der aussergermanischen Literatur über das Auftreten der Ich-Paraklese unterrichten.[19] In den soteriologischen Reden der orientalischen Pseudopropheten spielt sie eine grosse Rolle. Ein Beispiel ist uns bei dem Kirchenschriftsteller Origines erhalten,[20] wenn er den Christenfeind Celsus eine solche *ῥῆϐις* eines phönikischen oder samaritanischen Phropheten beginnen lässt: *'Εγὼ ὁ εός εἰμι ἢ εοῦ παῖς ἢ πνεῦμα εῖον . . . ἐγὼ δὲ σῶσαι ἐλω* "Ich bin Gott oder Gottes Sohn oder der göttliche Geist. . . . ich aber will euch retten." Sehr häufig ist die Wendung *ἐγὼ εἰμι* in den johannäischen Reden; man vergleiche Joh. 6, 35: *εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ 'Ιησοῦς · ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς* "Jesus sprach zu ihnen: ich bin das Brot des Lebens;" Joh. 8, 12; *ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* "ich bin das Licht der Welt"; Joh. 10, 7; *ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων* "ich bin die Tür zu den Schafen"; Joh. 11, 25: *ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή* "ich bin die Auferstehung und das Leben."

---

[15] Festschrift zu Vilhelm Thomsens 70. Geburtstag 15 ff.; Bergens Museums Aarbok 1911, No. 11; Norges Indskrifter med de ældre Runer, Bd. II, 2, 615 ff.; Om Troldruner (=Fordomtima II); Eggjum—Stenens Indskrift med de ældre Runer, Kristiania 1919.

[16] Zahlreiche Beispiele bei S. Chr. Bang, Norske Heaeformularer og magiske Opskrifter 1901.—Fr. Kraus, Zaubersprüche und Krankheitssegen aus dem Rösnerland. Korr.-Bl. des Ver. f. siebenb. Landesk. 42/43, 39 ff. mw 44, 25 ff.

[17] A. Wuttke, Der deutsche Volksaberglaube, 177 ff.

[18] A. Dieterich, A-B-C-Denkmäler in Kleine Schriften 202 ff. und M. Olsen in den oben genannten Schriften.

Man wende nicht ein, dass Jesus sich ganz natürlich so habe ausdrücken müssen, denn die Wendung "ich bin . . ." findet sich dafür zu häufig und gerade an den Stellen gehobener Redeweise, wo Jesus starken Eindruck auf die Hörer machen will. Eine Zufälligkeit erscheint auch deshalb ausgeschlossen, weil die Ich-Formel in noch weit höheres Altertum hinaufreicht.

In der mystischen (hermetischen wie gnostischen) Literatur des hellenisierten Orients ist die Formel weit verbreitet. So spricht der Samaritaner Simon beim Verfasser des Martyriums Petri und Pauli[21] zum Kaiser Nero: *ἄκουσον, ἀγαθὲ βασλεῦ · ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ νιὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐφανοῦ καταβάς* Höre, o guter König: ich bin der Sohn Gottes, der vom Himmel herabgestiegen ist." Zu der Quelle für diese Literaturgattung gehört aber (freilich unbewusster Weise) die althellenische Prophetie und auch hier findet man die Ich-Prädikation, wenn z.B. Empedokles in der Vorrede zu einem Gedicht sagt: "Ich aber wandle jetzt ein unsterblicher Gott, nicht mehr ein Sterblicher vor euch." Offenbar ist seit alter Zeit im vorderen Orient ein soteriologischer Redetypus gang und gäbe gewesen, bei dem die Ich-Formel eine erhebliche Rolle spielte. Zahlreichen Sedimenten dieses Redetypus begegnen wir im alten Testament; ich erinnere nur an den Beginn des Dekalogs (im griechischen Gewand der Septuaginta): *'Εγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεός σου*. . . . "Ich bin der Herr, dein Gott." Doch hier ist er nicht original, sondern geht, wie das hebräische Schrifttum überhaupt, auf ältere Vorbilder zurück.

---

[19] Die meisten Hinweise verdanke ich der Zusammenstellung bei A. Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, 92 ff. und E. Norden, Agnostos Theos, 188 ff.

[20] Buch VIII, 8 f.

[21] Acta apocrypha ed. Lipsius-Bonnet I, 132.

Wenden wir uns noch weiter ostwärts, so treffen wir auf die gleiche Redewendung an vielen Stellen in den dreisprachigen keilinschriftlichen Texten der persischen Achämeniden. So sagt Kyros in der Tonzylinderinschrift[22]: "Ich (bin) Kyros, der König, der grosse König, der mächtige König, König von Babylon, König von Šumer und Akkad . . . u. s. w." Darius I in der grossen Inschrift von Bīsutûn:[23] Ich (bin) Darius, der grosse König, König der Könige, König in Persien . . . u.s.w." Ja selbst auf unbedeutenden Gegenständen wie Gewichten und Siegeln steht die Formel, offenbar zum Zwecke der Weihung.[24] Sein Nachfolger Xerxes bedient sich ihrer gleichfalls zu Anfang der von ihm herrührenden Inschriften,[25] nachdem er in der ersten Strophe Ahuramasda im gleichen feierlichen Stil wie sein Vorgänger angerufen hat.

Wie das Schriftsystem der persischen Inschriften, so geht auch die von ihren Königen zur Selbstprädikation verwendete Formel auf das Vorbild des assyrisch-babylonischen Stils zurück, dessen religiöse Ausprägung auch für den jüdischen Brauch Muster gewesen ist. Wir nähern uns daher jetzt dem Urquell der Ich-Formel, wenn wir ihn in assyrisch-babylonischen religiösen Texten finden. So heisst es in einem Orakel an Asarrhadon:[26]

> Ich bin die Ischtar von Arbela!
> Aschschur habe ich dir gnädig gestimmt. . . .
> Ich bin Nebo, der Herr des Schreibmeissels.
> Preise mich!

Oder in einem Beschwörungstext—also unseren Runeninschriften vergleichbar—heisst es:[27]

---

[22] F. H. Weissbach, Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden, S. 5.

[23] Ebenda S. 9.

[24] Ebenda S. 105.

[25] Ebenda S. 109.

[26] Edv. Lehmann, Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte S. 119.

[27] Ebenda S. 129 und in etwas anderer Fassung: A. Ungnad, Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer, S. 291.

> Der Beschwörer, der Oberpriester, bin ich, der rein ausführt die Zeremonien von Eridu, der Bote Eas, der vor ihm einhergeht, bin ich. Marduks, des weisen Reinigungspriesters, des erstgeborenen Sohnes Eas, Bote bin ich. Der Beschwörer von Eridu, dessen Beschwörung kunstvoll ist, bin ich. . . .

Während in ältester Zeit die Selbstprädikation nur dem Gott zukommt, wendet sie später auch dessen Vertreter, der Priester oder der Priesterkönig, auf sich an. So spricht Hammurapi in seiner Einleitung zu seinem Rechts kodex:[28]

> Hammurapi, der Hirte, der von Enlil Berufene bin ich. . . .

und nun folgen die zahlreichen Eigenschaften und Taten des grossen Königs in einer langen Liste.

Wie bekannt, ist das babylonische Ritual nur der Abklatsch des älteren sumerischen, das die einziehenden Semiten mitsamt der übrigen Kultur (Schriftsystem u.s.w.) einfach übernommen haben. Bei den Sumerern sind wir somit am Endpunkt der stilistischen Reihe angelangt, die wir vom neuen Testament über die Gnosis, das alte Testament, die persischen Keilinschriften und die babylonischassyrischen Texte bis an den Anfang der uns bis jetzt zugänglichen menschlichen Kulturen im vorderen Orient in ununterbrochener Reihe verfolgen konnten.

Merkwürdigerweise findet sich die Ich-Prädikation in ihrer ältesten, auf Götter beschränkten Anwendung auch in Ägypten. So heisst es im 17. Kapitel des Totenbuchs:[29]

> Ich bin Atum, indem ich allein bin im Urwasser, ich bin Re in seinem ersten Erglänzen. . . . Ich bin der grosse Gott, der von selbst entstand, der seine Namen schuf, der Herr der Neunheit der Götter . . . u.s.w.

Über die Frage, ob ein Zusammenhang zwischen der ägyptischen und sumerischen religiösen Form der Selbstprädikation besteht, lässt sich nichts Bestimmtes sagen. Das Werden der Kultur in den Gebieten des Nil und des Zweistromlands ist ja noch in Dunkel gehüllt; sie tritt uns auf beiden Gebieten beim Beginn der geschichtlichen Überlieferung (4. Jahrtausend v. Chr.) schon auf einer Höhe entgegen, die eine lange Entwicklung voraussetzt.

Wohl aber können wir nachweisen, dass zwischen der sumerischen Form der Selbstprädikation und der magischen Formel der germanischen Runenmeister ein Filiationsverhältnis besteht, das wir im Vorangehenden bis zum vorderen Orient verfolgt haben. Es fehlt nur noch die Brücke zum germanischen Norden. Diese bieten uns die in Ägypten in grosser Anzahl zu Tage getretenen Zauberpapyri.

---

[28] Edv. Lehmann, S. 76.

[29] Edv. Lehmann, S. 49.

Zauberei war ja schon in alter Zeit in Ägypten (wie überall auf Erden) im Schwang—wir denken an die Zauberkünste Moses im alten Testament—und die Inschriften liefern uns zahlreiche Zaubertexte.[30] In einem Zauberspruch des neuen Reiches spricht Rē zu Isis: "Ich bin der, der Himmel und Erde machte . . . ich bin der, der das Wasser machte und die Himmelsflut schuf . . . u.s.w." mit fortwährenden Ich- Prädikationen.

Die Form der Beschwörung hat sich von der ältesten bis in die historische Zeit unverändert erhalten; nur wurde in die alte Form neuer Inhalt gegossen, als die alten Götter erblassten und neue Mächte an ihre Stelle traten. Eine hervorragende Rolle spielte der Judengott **Jehovah** (oder wie er in den Zauberinschriften heisst: **Jao**) in der spätägyptischen Zauberei. Sein Name oder seine Prädikate erscheinen oft in den griechischen Zauberpapyri aus Ägypten. Eine öfter angewendete Formel lautet mit Gebrauchsanweisung:[31] *Λέγε πρὸς ἀνατολάς · Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δύο Χεφουβεὶν, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν δύο φύσεων, οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης κτλ.*

Sprich nach Osten gewandt: "Ich bin der über den beiden Cherubim, mitten zwischen den zwei Naturen, Himmel und Erde, Sonne und Mond u.s.w."

Aehnlich spricht auf einer Tabella defiionalis aus Amisos der Zauberer im Namen der Gottheit: *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μέγας ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ καθήμενος* "ich bin der grosse (Gott), der im Himmel thronende."[32]

Aber auch die alten Götter sind nicht untergegangen, wie wir aus einem andern Papyrus[33] ersehen, wo ein merkwürdiger Synkratismus herrscht: *Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός ὃν οὐδεὶς ὁρᾷ οὐδὲ προπετῶς ὀνομάζει . . . ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἥλιος. . . ἐγώ εἰμι Ἀφροδείτη προσαγορευομένη Τύφη. . . . ἐγώ εἰμι Κρόνος . . . ἐφώ εἰμι μήτηρ θεῶν ἡ*

---

[30] A. Erman, Die ägyptische Religion, S. 148 ff.

[31] C. Leemans, Papyri Graeci Lugduni-Batavi II, 101.

[32] R. Wünsch, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 1909, 25 zitiert bei Th. Schermann, Griech. Zauberpapyri in Texte und Untersuchungen zur altschristl. Lit. III, 4, Bd. II a (1909), S. 44, Anm. 5.

[33] C. Leemans, a. a. O. S. 27.

καλουμένη οὐράνιος. εγώ εἰμι Ὄσιρις ὁ καλούμενος ὕδωρ. ἐγώ εἰμι Ἶϐις ἡ καλουμένη δρόϐος κτλ. κτλ.

"Ich bin der Gott, den niemand sieht noch leichtfertig nennt (also Jehovah) . . . ich bin die Sonne . . . ich bin Aphrodite mit dem Beinamen Typhe . . . ich bin Kronos . . . ich bin die Mutter der Götter, die Himmlische genannt; ich bin Osiris, der das Wasser (Totenfluss?) genannt wird; ich bin Isis, die der Tau genannt wird u.s.w. u.s.w."

Die Häufung der Formel *ἐγώ εἰμι* schliesst jeden Zweifel aus, dass sie etwa nur eine alltägliche Redensart ohne religiösen Hintergrund sei. Im Grossen Pariser Zauberbuch[34] kommt sie sehr oft vor; so heisst es Zeile 573: *λεγε σιγη σιγη ολ ˙ εγω ειμι συμπλανος υμιν αστηρ και εκ του βαθους αναλαμπων*
"Sprich! Stille! Stille!
Ich bin der mit euch umherschweifende Stern, der aus der Tiefe aufleuchtet." Zeile 1018: *εγω ειμι ο πεφυκως εκ του ουρανου* "Ich bin der aus dem Himmel Entsprossene." Wichtig für die Art des germanischen Runenzaubers ist die Anweisung in demselben Papyrus Zeile 1075: *γραψας επ αυτου ζμυρναν ταυτα εγω ειμι ωρος αλκιβ αρσαμωσις ιαω.*

"Nachdem du auf demselben Myrrhenblatt folgendes geschrieben hast: Ich bin Horos, Alkib, Arsamoses, Jao." Wir denken unwillkürlich an die Strophen 6 ff. der eddischen Sigrdrifumǫl, wo Anweisung gegeben wird, Runen zu Zauberzwecken auf die verschiedenartigsten Gegenstände (Baumrinde, Ruder, Hand, Schnabel u.s.w.) zu schreiben und dabei den Namen des Gottes Tȳr zu nennen.

Die Nennung eines magisch wirksamen Namens war also wesentlich.

Der Namenzauber, den wir in Ägypten wie im germanischen Norden treffen, war im ganzen hellenisierten Orient seit alter Zeit verbreitet. Die ihm zu Grunde liegende Vorstellung war, dass der Name dem Träger Macht verleiht. Wenn ein Gott oder ein seine Stelle auf Erden vertretender Mensch (Priester, König) seinen Namen ausspricht und dies zudem noch schriftlich dokumentiert, so weichen die Dämonen, die vor nichts mehr Angst haben als vor einem sie zwingenden und bindenden Namen. Es unterliegt keinem Zweifel, dass die Goten, als sie in die Kulturzone des vorderen Orients einbezogen wurden, diesen Namenzauber (wie auch den Buchstaben-und Zahlenzauber) kennen lernten und ihn mit den wohl bei ihnen erfundenen Runen ausübten. Auf den nie unterbrochenen Verbindungswegen zwischen ihnen und ihren germanischen Stammesgenossen gelangten dann Runen und Runenzauber nach dem Norden, wo uns die Zeugnisse dafür erhalten blieben, weil hier das jedem Zauber feindliche Christentum erst spät seinen Einzug hielt und die volkstümlichen Bräuche viel schonender behandelte als auf dem Kontinent. Doch wie die Inschrift der Freilaubersheimer Spange zeigt, fehlt ein Zeugnis für die zauberische Ich-Formel auch hier nicht.

---

[34] Herausgegeben von C. Wessely, Griechische Zauberpapyri. Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie der Wiss. Philos.-Hist. Kl. 36, II, 27 ff.

Wenn wir im germanischen Norden die spätesten Zeugnisse einer Jahrtausende alten religiösen Tradition finden, die ihren Ursprung im Zweistromland (Mesopotamien) hat so stellt sich diese Erscheinung in Parallele zu der für die germanische Urgeschichte wichtigsten Überlieferung aus dem klassischen Altertum, der Germania des Tacitus. Auch dieses Buch steht als letztes und spätestes Glied einer langen Reihe da, die bei den jonischen Historiographen des 6. Jahrhunderts vor Christus beginnt und bei allen Geschichtswerken griechischen Geistes als unumgängliche Beigabe geschätzt wurde, der ethenographischen Schilderung der behandelten Völker. Auch in die Germania sind weitverbreitete literarische Überlieferungen des Altertums in reicher Fülle eingeströmt, wie *Eduard Norden* in einem unlängst erschienenen gehaltvollen Buche gezeigt hat.[35] So verknüpft sich der heutigen wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnis der zeitlich und räumlich ferne Orient mit dem germanischen Norden auf mannigfachen Wegen. Der Gedanke eines isolierten Daseins der Germanen vor ihrer Berührung mit dem Römertum, der so lange die geschichtlichen Darstellungen beherrscht hat, muss endgültig fallen gelassen werden. Auch für die Germanen gilt zum Teil wenigstens was *Adolf Erman* jüngst wieder in einer Akademierede[36] von dem geistigen Leben des Abendlands gesagt hat:

> Wir leben doch alle von dem grossen Strom der Kultur,
> der seinen Ursprung im Orient hat.

Berlin SIGMUND FEIST

---

[35] Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania. Leipzig-Berlin 1920. Zweiter Abdruck mit Nachträgen 1922.

[36] Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akademie der Wiss. 1922, S. XXVIII.

SEMANTIC NOTES

NE. *baffle*

The NED., after discussing the possible influence of Fr. *beffler* 'deceive, mock or gull with faire words' (Cotgr.) and Fr. *baffouer* 'hoodwink, deceive, besmeare' (Cotgr.) as well as the Scotch *bauchle* 'treat contemptiously' on NE. *baffle*, comes to the conclusion that there is a confusion of two or possibly three stems in the word. This confusion is not one of phonetic form but one of the variety of meanings which apparently cannot be explained from any one of the above words. NE. *baffle* has the following meanings, the earliest dating from the 16th century (I give them as arranged by the NED.): 'disgrace, subject to public disgrace of infamy; vilify, run down; cheat, juggle, bewilder, confound, foil; hoodwink, gull, cheat, juggle, shuffle, quibble; bewilder, confuse, confound; frustrate, foil; struggle ineffectually, exert oneself in a futile manner.' The arrangement of the meanings here given is obviously an accommodation to the three assumed sources. But the two French sources are brought in apparently only to explain the meanings 'cheat, deceive.' Other meanings such as, 'bewilder, confound, confuse, frustrate, etc.' are left out of account and no explanation of them is attempted.

It is doubtful whether the French words have influenced NE. *baffle* in any way. Of the underlying meanings of these we have no trace in the English word. A similarity of phonetic form and the secondary meaning 'deceive' are hardly sufficient proof of influence.

We need not go outside of the NE. and the NE. dialects for an explanation of most of the meanings of NE. *baffle*. Scotch *bauchle* mentioned by Skeat and the NED. as furnishing some of the earliest meanings 'disgrace, vilify, etc.,' is probably the source of most of the meanings. According to Jamieson (Scotch Etym. Dict.) it has the following meanings: 'wrench, distort, put out of shape; treat contemptuously, vilify, *bauchle*, *bachle* 'shamble, move loosely on the hinder legs, walk as those who have flat soles, *sb.* whatsoever is treated with contempt or disregard; a mean, feeble creature; an awkward, clumsy person,' *bauch* 'weak, tired out, exhausted.' Wright, NE. dialect Dict. gives *baffle* these meanings: 'confuse, perplex, worry, annoy; impede, obstruct, thwart, balk; twist irregularly, entangle; cheat, humbug, make a fool of; insult bully, tease; strike, beat In the supplement of his Dictionary Wright further adds: *baffle* 'confuse, discredit; flutter, beat the wings,' *boffled* 'confused, rendered stupid.' From a comparison of the above, it would appear that the underlying meaning of the word was a movement from side to side as in walking in a slovenly manner or with a shambling gait. This meaning of the word Jamieson calls attention to more particularly by citing a number of Scotch dialect words, all with the ending-*chle*, such as: *jauchle, scrauchle, shauchle, trauchle, trachle, wauchle, hauchle, hychle,* and with such meanings as: 'move from side to side in walking, like a young child; walk with a shuffling gait, as with trailing feet, as with feeble joints, etc.' The suffix seems to have the frequentative force of *-le* in NE. *shamble, wriggle, waddle, waggle, hobble, etc.*

Such meanings as 'twist, distort, etc.' in NE. *baffle* develop directly from 'move from side to side in walking.' There also develop: 'walk awkwardly, unsteadily, walk in a slovenly manner; be clumsy, stupid, confused, perplexed; confound, bewilder, etc.'

For similar meanings in other words compare the following: NE. dial. *hyter* 'walk with tottering steps; work in a weak, unskilful manner, *sb.* an act of working or walking; state of confusion; nonsense, weak, stupid person,' Scotch *hyter* 'confusion, ruin, nonsense, act of walking with a weak tottering step, or working in a weak, confused manner; weak, stupid person.'

From the meanings 'perplex, bewilder, confuse' develop 'deceive, humbug, etc.' in *baffle* just as they do, for example, in the following: NE. *flummock, flommock*' go about in an untidy, slovenly way; trail the dress in a slovenly manner, *sb.* hurry, confusion, '*flummox* 'bewilder, perplex, puzzle, astound; overcome in an argument, non-plus, confound, baffle; cheat, deceive, 'NE. dial. *flummer* 'state of agitation, confusion,' Norw. dial. *fluma, floma*' tumble or flounder about as a horse in the mire.' Cf. Wood, Hesperia, Ergänz. I, §20.

Since, therefore, Fr. *beffler* and *baffouer* have been brought in merely to explain the meaning 'deceive' their connection becomes superfluous, if this meaning can be explained from the NE. dialects.

As for other influences on NE. *baffle*, it is very likely that such meanings as 'strike, beat, insult, bully,' in the NE. dialect word are influenced by NE. *baff* 'strike, beat' connected with Norm. Fr. *baffer* 'slap in the face,' Prov. *bafa* 'scoff,' which may be borrowed from MHG. *beffen* 'scold.' It is even likely that Fr. *beffler* and *baffouer* may be from the same word, a connection which Skeat suggests.

NE. *gum*

For this word the Century Dictionary records the following meanings: 'smear with gum, clog by gum or gumlike substance; play a trick upon, humbug, hoodwink (U. S. slang).' For the last three meanings it gives this explanation: "said to be from the fact that opossums and racoons often elude hunters and dogs by hiding in the thick foliage of gum trees." I have been unable to trace the origin of this explanation, but the uses of the word given by the Cent. Dict. and the NED. do not in the least indicate any such origin. The explanation, in fact, smacks of 'folk-etymology.'

The quotations are:

"You can't gum me, I tell you now,
An' so you needn't try." Lowell, *Biglow Papers, Ist series*
(*Cent. Dict.*, NED.)

"I began to think he was quizzing me—'gumming' is the proper Transatlantic colloquialism." Sala, *Tw. Round the Clock* (1861).
(NED.)

This much is clear about the word. It is used here in the sense of 'deceive,' and its use with this meaning is confined to the United States.

Two very natural semantic developments of the meaning 'deceive' in this word are possible. In the first place, if we take ME. *gomme*<Fr. *gomme*<Lat. *gummi* as the phonetic antecedents, 'deceive' develops from 'smear with gum, clog or stick by a gumlike substance' directly, just as in NE. *stick* 'smear with a viscuous or glutinous matter; impose upon, cheat (slang),' and numerous other words in the Germanic dialects especially.

Secondly, it may have developed (and this seems still more likely) from E. Dial. *gum* 'impertinent talk, chatter, 'jaw,' insolent talk; deceitful speech,' *gummy* 'deceitful, boastful.' Compare the following quotations from the NED.: "Come, let us have no more of your gum." Grose, *Dict. Vulg. Tongue.* "Come, none of your gum—now you are but an underling" R. B. Peake, *Americans Abroad.*

The use of this noun as a verb, a very common occurrence in slang, gives us a meaning parallel to the use in the quotations above. Note especially the quotation from Sala defining 'gumming' as 'quizzing' by which he means 'bantering talk.' Here, then, the idea 'deceive' develops from the meaning of the substantive *gum* 'flesh of the jaws': ME. *gome,* OE. *gōma* 'jaws, palate' just as, for example, the following: E. dial. *gag* 'ridicule, quiz; hoax, deceive,' NE. *gag*' impose upon, ply with talk, 'stuff,' deceive': OE. *gagul,* MDu. *gaghel* 'palatum, caelum oris.'

Now it is possible that the word may have been used by hunters of the opossum in the meaning 'deceive,' but it is not probable that he originated the meaning 'deceive' as that could easily have been current.

NHG. *belemmern*

Kluge (Etym. Wb. 9, 45.) regards NHG. *belemmern* 'betrügen' as of Low German origin, derived from the comparative of Germ. **lam-* in NHG. *lahm,* etc., and compares MLG. *belemmern* 'verleumden, belästigen' without any further explanation of or investigation into the meanings of the word in the other German dialects. Evidently he erroneously believes that 'betrügen' develops from 'hindern, belästigen.' Weigand (DWb., 199) calls attention to the prevalent meaning in the High German, viz. 'beschmutzen,' and surmises correctly that 'betrügen' develops from this. But he is puzzled by the apparently unrelated meanings of the MLG. and MDu. forms.

The word appears in the various NHG. dialects as follows: Early NHG. *belemmern, belampern, belemmeln* 'bedrecken, sordidare,' NHG. *belemmern* 'sich beschmutzen, durch kleine Kniffe betrügen, übers Ohr hauen,' Sax. *belämmern, belämpern*' 'einen etwas einreden, ihn herumkriegen; betrügen,' *belemmern* 'besudeln, belasten, hintergehen,' Westph. *belämmern* 'beschmutzen; hintergehen, überlisten, übervorteilen, betrügen, 'Pruss. *belämmern* 'besudeln, verunreinigen, übervorteilen, betrügen,' KurHess. *belemmern, belammeln* 'beschmutzen;

betrügen, hintergehen,' *lammel* 'der beschmutzte untere Rand des Weiberrockes,' *belammeln* 'den Rock am unteren Rande beschmutzen.'

The meanings of the NHG. word clearly indicate the semantic development 'befoul: deceive,' a common development in the German dialects. MLG. *belemmern*, MDu. *belemmeren*,' 'hindern, hemmen,' EFris. *lemmern* hindern, hemmen, aufhalten,' *belemmern* zum Stehen bringen; aufhalten, hemmen hindern, lähmen; beschweren, belasten' do not develop the meaning 'deceive' at all and are unrelated semantically. These forms are explained by Franck (Etym. Wb.) as coming from the stem **lam-* in NHG. *lahm*, OHG. *bilemen* 'lähmen,' MLG. *lemmen*, MDu. *lemen* 'lähmen, lahm machen,' etc. But this connection does not satisfactorily explain the meanings of the NHG. words.

These belong to another base, the Germ. **limp- *lamp-* 'hang down, hang loosely.' Compare the following words from this base: NE. *limp* 'walk lamely, *adj.* flaccid, pliant, hanging down,' MHG. *lampen* 'welk niederhängen,' *limpfen* 'hinken,. Swiss *lampe* 'Wamme, herabhängender Lappen': Skt. *lâmbate* 'hängt herab,' Lat. *limbus* 'Besatz am, Kleide.' Cf. Fick, Wb. III,^{4} 363.

The meaning 'soil, befoul' in NHG. *belemmern* comes from a form like Hess. *lammel* 'der beschmutzte untere Rand des Weiberrockes,' i.e. 'the part of the dress hanging down and therefore soiled,' *belammeln* 'den Rock am unterem Rande beschmutzen,' early NHG. *belampern*, *belemmeln* 'sordidare.'

Note the same semantic development in Als. *hammel* 'der beschmutzte nasse Saum eines Frauenrockes; unreinliche, dicke, böse Frauensperson,' *hammeln* 'sich beschmutzen,' Lothr. *hammelen* 'den unteren Rand der Kleider beschmutzen,' KurHess. *behammeln* 'beschmutzen; betrügen.'

NFris. *bislanterje* 'onder het eten zich bemorsen; bekladden, een smet aanwrijven; bedriegen, soil in eating; besmear, stain, deceive,' EFris. *slunteren* 'schlottern, schlaff, lose, u. unordentlich hängen,' *slunte* 'unreinliche Person.'

It is probable that Kluge and Franck are right regarding the origin of the Low German and Dutch forms. We have here a case of different stems **limp-*, **lamp-*, and **lam-*, **lōm-*, developing synonymous meanings. Compare the meanings given for *_limp-_, *_lamp-_ above with the following from the stem *_lam-_ *_lōm-_: MHG. OHG. _lam_ 'gliederschwach, lahm,' NE. _lame_, ON. _lemja_ 'hindern,' OHG., MHG. _lemen_, 'lähmen,' EFris., _lōm_ 'gelähmt, hinkend, matt,' Du. _loom_ 'lahm, träge, faul, langsam,' MHG. _luomen_ 'matt, schlaff sein od. werden.'

Du. _lorrendraaier_

An attempt has been made by Falk-Torp (Etym. Wb., 665) to explain this Dutch word from which the Dan. _lurendreier_ was borrowed. The Dutch word has the meanings 'smuggler, deceiver' and is used today principally among sailors speaking the Low German and Scandinavian dialects. Falk-Torp derive the first part of the compound from Du. _loer_ 'Lump, Tölpel' which is identical with Du. _luur_ 'Windel,' OHG. _lūdara_, _lodera_ ibid., OS. _lodara_ 'Fetzen,' found also in the shorter form in OHG. _lodo_, _ludo_ 'grobes Wollenzeug,' NHG. _loden_, etc., from a Germ. base *_lub-_ 'hang down loosely.'

The semantic connection between these and the compound is arrived at in the following ingenious way. There is a Dutch expression _iemand een loer draaien_ corresponding to NHG. _einem eine Nase drehen_ 'deceive,' as well as an older NHG. expression _einem ein Lödlein eintragen_ also meaning 'deceive,' an expression referring to the dishonest weaver who weaves poor wool (_Lödlein_ is diminutive of NHG. _Loden_, cf. above) into cloth. In the Low German the word corresponding to Du. _loer_ has the forms _lurde_, _lorde_, _lurre_ 'Fetzen, Sorrgarn aus altem Tauwerk' with the additional meaning 'verfälschtes Tauwerk' from which are supposed to have developed 'Lüge, Erfindung, falscher Pass, falsches Dokument, 'which we find in LG. _lurrendreier_ 'einer, der mit falschem Pass oder falscher Flagge fährt; Betrüger.' Starting with the expression _iem. een loer draaien_, _lorrendraaier_ would apparently, according to this explanation, have the following semantic development: 'one who mixes (twists) shoddy wool into cloth (in weaving), adulterater, falsifier; one who goes with a false pass or under a false flag: smuggler, deceiver.'

The compound appears in verb as well as noun form. Compare the following: Du. _lorrendraaier_ 'smokkelaar, schipper van een smokkelvaartuig; schip, voor den sluikhandel gebezigd; bedrieger, misleider, smuggler, the skipper of a smuggler (ship);

a ship used in the smuggling trade; cheat, deceiver,' ***lorrendraaien*** 'sluikhandel drijven, misleiden, bedriegen, carry on a smuggling trade, deceive,' EFris. ***lurendreier***, ***lurrendreier*** 'ein Mensch, der andere Leute durch allerhand Kniffe u. Pfiffe hinters Licht führt, Betrüger, Schurke,' Dan. ***lurendreier*** 'betrügerische u. listige Person, Duckmäuser, Leisetreter,' Swed. ***lurendrägere*** 'Schleichhändler.' It will be seen from a comparison of these words that the idea common to all is that of some furtive, stealthy, surreptitious action, such as is practiced by the smuggler. But such an idea is not in evidence in the semantic explanation of Falk-Torp, for to 'go with a false pass' does not imply 'going surreptitiously'; in fact, the implication is rather the opposite of a secret, stealthy action.

An investigation of the possible sources of our word is somewhat confusing. We have, for example, the following words: Du. ***loer***, ***lor***, ***leur***, ***luier*** and ***luur*** all meaning 'cloth, rag, patch, worthless article, etc.' besides a variety of other meanings from other stems which must be kept distinct from these. The above words may all represent a Germ. base ***luþ-*** 'hang down loosely' as accepted by Falk-Torp, since the different dialect usages of the word account for the variety of spellings. (Cf. Franck, *Etym. Wb.* s. v. ***leur***, ***luier***, ***lor***). Various verbs have developed from this stem, of which let us note especially the following: MDu. (Kil.) ***leuren***, ***loren*** 'trekken, traag handelen, drag, act slowly, lazily' (Franck, s.v. ***lurken***), MDu. ***loren***, ***lorren*** 'betrügen, pfuschen, heimlichen u. unerlaubten Handel treiben,' Du. ***leuren*** 'einen Klein- od. Hökerhandel od. auch einen Schleichhandel betreiben,' ***lorren*** 'betrügen, anführen,' Antwp. ***lörren*** smokkelen, heimlijk, diefachtig wegdragen, smuggle, carry off secretly, stealthily' (Dornkaat Koolman, *Wb. d. OstFries. Spr.*). The *Woordenboek d. nederlandsch Taal* (s.v. ***leuren***) gives these meanings for Du. ***leuren***: 1. 'venten, carry on a trade; 2. lappen knoeirrig herstellen, knoeien, onhandig met iets omgaan, bedrieglijk handelen, bedriegen, patch, bungle, botch, handle awkwardly, act deceptively, deceive; 3. sleuren, drag.' A comparison of MDu. ***leuren***, ***loren***, ***lorren***, and Du. and Du. dial. ***leuren***, ***lorren***, ***lörren*** shows these to be probable variants of the same stem. The semantic development is clear and can be paralleled by many words in the German dialects. Such words show a semantic development analogous to the following:

'move back and forth, work in a careless manner; dawdle, fritter away time; botch, bungle, be awkward, slovenly, trifling, deceptive; do something in a surreptitious, stealthy manner: deceive.' With the ideas botch, bungle, be awkward, slovenly are associated such meanings as 'hang loosely,' or 'a piece of cloth, rag, patch, etc.' Conversely, a word meaning 'a rag, patch, a worthless piece of cloth, etc.' may develop verb ideas such as 'work carelessly, botch, etc.' Compare: MHG. *blez* 'Lappen, Flicken, Fetzen,' Swiss *bletzen* 'flicken, pfuschen, durchprügeln, p. part. angeführt, betrogen,' *anbletzen* 'anlügen, zum besten haben,' Als. *bletzen* mit einen Lappen besetzen, flicken; hintergehen, betrügen.'

Whatever the origin of Du. *leuren* may be, this development of meaning in the word seems clear: 'drag, act lazily, awkwardly; botch, bungle, be trifling, stealthily deceptive: deceive.' Note the similar development in: EFris. *fudden* 'unordentlich und nachlässig arbeiten, pfuschen; heimlich beiseite schaffen; *fudde* 'Lappen, Fetzen, NE. *fode* 'waste time, delay, postpone a matter by evasive excuses; beguile,' Westph. *füdeln* 'betrügen,' Als. *fudlen* 'eine Arbeit langsam verrichten, oberflächlich arbeiten.'

Antwp., WFlem., SEFlem. *foefelen* 'haastig en ruw, slordig iets bijeendoen; heimlijk verbergen, noffelen; bedrieglijk te werk gaan; brodelen, knoeien, put together in a hasty, clumsy slovenly manner; hide secretly, shuffle, act deceptively; botch, bungle, 'Antwp., WFlem. Zaan. *foefen* 'bedektelijk bedriegen, foppen,' *befoefelen* 'heimlijk bedriegen,' WFlem. *foef* 'vod, lap, rag, piece of cloth.' But Du. *leuren* also means 'carry on a trade.' The association of this meaning with the foregoing idea of a stealthy action developed 'carry on a trade stealthily, secretly: smuggle.'

The word *lorrendraaier*, then, developing from the expression *iem. een loer draaien* 'deceive' gets the meaning 'smuggler, etc.' not through the LG. *lurde, lorde, lurre* 'verfälschtes Tauwerk,' etc., but from the meanings of the related Du. *leuren*, *lorren*. (Falk-Torp regard *lorren* as developing 'deceive' through the meanings 'verfälschtes Tauwerk, etc.' But compare the semantic explanation above.) The word originally probably meant 'deceiver' and was formed just as, for example, NHG. *Nasendreher* 'deceiver' might be formed from *einem eine Nase drehen* 'deceive,' but that would not explain the meaning 'smuggler.' The explanation for this must be sought for in Du. *leuren, lorren* which also meant 'deceive,' but which developed this meaning in an entirely different way.

Samuel Kroesch

University of Minnesota

HEINRICH VON KLEIST'S "DER PRINZ VON HOMBURG"[1]

Ein Verhängniss ist es wohl, dass das letzte sonnenklare Drama Heinrich's von Kleist von den drängenden Schatten einer grübelnden Kritik verdunkelt wird, und durch den Eifer der Interpreten, durch das Blei der Erwägungen die schlichte, rührende Tragik des Stückes eine unnötige Belastung erfährt und unser inneres Gefühl ins Schwanken gebracht wird. Verwirrend wirkt hauptsächlich die anfängliche Strenge des Kurfürsten, sein Beschluss die Pflichtversäumnis des jungen Prinzen mit aller Entschiedenheit zu strafen, um dem Gesetze, dem Leitstern seines Staates, unbedingte Achtung zu verschaffen. Dünkte ihm wirklich die Schmach des durch Ungehorsam und Trotz erlangten Sieges so gross, um gleich zum äussersten Mittel der Sühne, dem Tode des Schuldigen, zu greifen, und erbarmungslos das vom Kriegsgericht gefällte Urteil vollstrecken lassen zu wollen? Erstickte er selbst gewalttätig im Herzen alle milden Gefühle, verjagte er alle Gedanken der Gnade, oder drohte er bloss mit dem furchtbaren Todesgespenst, um die schliessliche Bekehrung und Heilung des Helden zu erzielen? Und war sein fester Vorsatz die Aufopferung des Prinzen, seines Lieblings, auf dem Altare des Vaterlands; wann und wodurch erfolgte seine innerliche Umkehr, die zur Begnadigung führte? Welche Stimmen waren massgebend? Wollte er noch kurz vor dem letzten Entschlusse die delphische Weisheit seiner Offiziere mit einer Verstellungskomödie irreführen?

Müssige Fragen, die den Kern der Schöpfung nicht berühren und unser Verständniss so wenig fördern wie das häufige Hervorheben der Gegensätze im Seelendrama: Empfindung und Vernunft, jugendliche Bestürzung und Besonnenheit des reifen Mannes, die Gebote des Herzens und jene der Pflicht, das Recht des Individuums und die Erfordernisse des Staates, der Nation. Gewiss liebte der Dichter die scharfen Kontraste; die Kämpfe im Gemüte seiner Helden steigerte er geflissentlich ins Mass— und Grenzenlose; aus den höchsten Dissonanzen des Lebens entnahm er oft die überwältigende Harmonie seiner Kunst. Im Labyrinth der Menschenbrust sah er aber das Wirken dunkler, geheimnissvoll kontrastirender Kräfte, die steigenden, die sinkenden Wellenberge und Wellentäler des Gefühls, und mit dem Gleichmut der Athleten, mit der starren Festigkeit der fertig entwickelten und nicht mehr im Werden begriffenen Individuen wusste er nichts anzufangen. Mit diesem Complex von Empfindungen und den immer tätigen, menschenbildenden Seelenkräften musste sein Drama rechnen. Sein "Prinz von Homburg" sollte die innere Läuterung eines jungen, durch Leichtsinn, Torheit und Ehrgeiz in grosses Verschulden geratenen Helden darstellen, dem ein mächtiges Aufrütteln seines Gewissens und selbst ein Gleiten und Drängen der Todesschatten über die tollkühnen Pläne der Selbstüberhebung notwendig waren, um in der tiefsten Tiefe der eignen Brust die Stimme der Pflicht zu vernehmen. Dieses schlummernde Pflichtgefühl zu wecken, und, in ernster Stunde, den Verblendeten und Irregeleiteten zur Einsicht in sein Vergehen zu bringen, war Aufgabe des weisen Staatslenkers, der nicht im Entfernsten an ein Ersticken der Lebenskeime in der Seele des jungen Fürsten dachte, seinen Liebling gewiss niemals, selbst mit dem festen Erfassen des Todesurteils, dem Tode weihen wollte, vielmehr ein volles, unerschütterliches Vertrauen zu seinen edlen Instinkten hegte, und den Augenblick des Erwachens des noch ungeahnten kategorischen Imperatives herbeisehnte, um den zur richtigen Schätzung der Nichtigkeit aller Lebensgüter gelangten Jüngling zur vollen Entfaltung seiner Gaben, zum höchsten Genuss seiner Lebensfülle, zu führen.

---

[1] Gedanken und Betrachtungen aus meinem im zweiten Kriegsjahre gehaltenen Kolleg über Heinrich von Kleist. Eine allgemeine Charakteristik Kleists in italienischer Sprache enthält das Buch *L'opera d'un maestro* Torino 1920.

Lasst die Jugend gewähren, denn ihr gehört das Leben, durch die Jugend allein erzwingen wir das Höchste. Die innere Gärung ineinander wirkender Kräfte im Jüngling gestattet freilich keine Ruhe im Denken und im Handeln; stürmisch, auf regellosen Bahnen, durch die Macht unüberlegter Impulse, unaufhaltsam wird man weiter und weiter gedrängt. Der zum Mann gereifte Dichter dachte an seinen eigenen Lebensfrühling, den wirren ungestümen Lauf ins Ungewisse. Wäre ihm doch, wie seinem Sieger in der Schlacht bei Fehrbellin, mild und streng ein weiser Lenker entgegengetreten! "Wir kennen die

Beschwörungsformel noch nicht," schrieb er, tastend noch im Jahre 1799, um "den sichern Weg des Glücks zu finden," "um die wunderbar ungleichartigen Gestalten, die in unserem Innern wühlen und durcheinander treiben, zu besänftigen und zu beruhigen. Und alle Jünglinge, die wir um und neben uns sehen, teilen ja mit uns dieses Schicksal. Alle ihre Schritte und Bewegungen scheinen nur die Wirkung eines unfühlbaren aber gewaltigen Stosses zu sein, der sie unwiderstehlich mit sich fortreisst. Sie erscheinen mir wie Kometen, die in regellosen Kreisen das Weltall durchschweifen, bis sie endlich eine Bahn und ein Gesetz der Bewegung finden." Wehmütig blickte Kleist damals in sein ewig bewegtes Herz. Stürme rissen ihn fort und fort. Es wankte jede Lebensstütze. Die besonnene Schwester Ulrike vernahm die bitteren Klagen. Unter die Menschen wollte der Dichter nicht passen. Und wiederum, von der Sehnsucht nach Ruhe erfasst, "wonach die ganze Schöpfung und alle immer langsamer und langsamer rollenden Weltkörper streben," greift er zum Bilde der regel-und ziellos ins Ungewisse irrenden Gestirne, um das Pochen und Glühen seines Herzens zu offenbaren, "das wie ein Planet unaufhörlich in seiner Bahn zur Rechten und zur Linken wankt."

Wüteten aber die Dämonen im Innern und schien auch die Welt, auf die die Götter kaum einen mildtätigen Blick warfen, aus den Fugen zu gehen, so blieb doch die Freude an diesem mutigen Wagen, und mächtigen Anschwellen der Gefühle in der beklommenen Brust; der höchste Ruhmeskranz winkte aus der Ferne; es gab kein Zögern, kein Schwanken im kühnen Siegeslauf, gerade so wie im tollen Vorwärtsdrängen Egmonts, der in überschwänglicher Rede sein "Frisch hinaus ins Feld" schmetterte, "ins Feld, wo aus der Erde dampfend jede nächste Wohltat der Natur und, durch die Himmel wehend, alle Segen der Gestirne einhüllend uns unwitteren; wo wir, dem erdgebornen Riesen gleich, von der Berührung unsrer Mutter kräftiger uns in die Höhe reissen; wo wir die Menschheit ganz und menschliche Begier in allen Adern fühlen; wo das Verlangen, vorzudringen, zu besiegen, zu erhaschen, seine Faust zu brauchen, zu besitzen, zu erobern, durch die Seele des jungen Jägers glüht; wo der Soldat sein angeboren Recht auf alle Welt mit raschem Schritt sich anmasst und in fürchterlicher Freiheit wie ein Hagelwetter durch Wiese, Feld und Wald verderbend streicht und keine Grenzen kennt, die Menschenhand gezogen."

Kleist's junger Held, der mit flammendem Eifer sich ins Gewühl der Schlacht stürzt, und, wie sein Dichter, Menschenruhm und Grösse als das begehrenswerteste Gut erachtete, das Gift des "unseligen Ehrgeizes" in sich sog, gepeitscht von den inneren Furien, unfähig noch dem Andrange und dem Sturme der Leidenschaften zu widerstehen, verbindet mit dem glühenden Empfinden und der unbändigen Energie der Tat die Zartheit und Weichheit eines Kindes. Der verwegene Kämpfer unterliegt einer tiefen Ohnmacht im Augenblick der tiefsten Seelenspannung. Mit rührender Scheu wagt er den Namen des geliebten Mädchens, das sein Tun und Denken gänzlich beherrscht, nicht zu nennen. Der Anblick lieblich duftender Blumen beglückt ihn; im märkischen Lande entdeckt er den grünen Lorbeer, womit er sich, träumend, eitel wie ein Mädchen, die Stirn umwindet. Ein "lieblicher Träumer"—so nannte auch Henriette Vogel im Taumel der Gefühle ihren Todesgefährten—wandelt er, sich selbst unbewusst, im Mondschein, durch den stillen Garten, dem er seine schwärmerischen Visionen anvertraut.

Wesshalb dieses Aufdrängen der Welt des Traumes in dieser so überaus konkreten und fasslichen Welt der künstlerischen Wirklichkeit? Hebbel, Dahlmann, und wie viele Andere noch, hätten in den Dramen Kleists, im "Käthchen" sowohl wie im "Prinz von Homburg," Magnetismus und Wandeln im Schlafe preisgegeben und alles Übersinnliche durch das Greifbare, Sichtbare und Sinnliche ersetzt! Gewiss hätte ein Liebesblick der Prinzessin mehr Wunder der Zerstreutheit und Geistesabwesenheit in dem Helden, während der Verteilung der Schlachtbefehle bewirkt, die Ungeduld, durch das eigenmächtige Eingreifen den schliesslichen Triumph herbeizuführen, begreiflicher gemacht, als alle träumerischen Visionen in der mondbeglänzten Zaubernacht. Ob aber dadurch der Zauber der Kleistschen Poesie nicht beeinträchtigt worden wäre, möchte ich bezweifeln. Das Unbewusste in dieser Wunderwelt, das geheimnissvoll Unfassbare in unserem Innenleben war es gerade, was den Dichter an seinem Lebensende am meisten beschäftigte. Seinen Anteil an dem grüblerischen Sinnen und Forschen Schuberts brauchen wir darum nicht zu übertreiben, um seine Sucht in jeder Menschenbrust Geheimnisse zu wittern, seinen Eifer im Enträtseln ("Und jeder Busen ist, der fühlt, ein Rätsel"—"Penthesilea") für erklärlich zu finden. Im Schlaf-und Traumzustande kann der Mensch gleichsam ein höheres seelisches Sein entwickeln, sein Wahrnehmungsvermögen klarer als bei wachen Sinnen entfalten. Die Last der äusseren Welt ist gefallen. Das Gefühl waltet allein. Das innere Auge durchschaut alle Herzenswirren. Alle Dissonanzen der Seele scheinen sich zu lösen. Ahnend wird in die Zukunft gegriffen. In lichtere Sphären gehoben, befreit von der Erdenschwere, tritt der Mensch den übernatürlichen Offenbarungen entgegen, und die Stimme Gottes ist ihm in der feierlichen Stille der Mysterienwelt lauter vernehmbar. Musste ja der feurige Prinz zur stillen Andacht neigen, und rühmte ihn auch Kottwitz, der ihn betend überraschte, als "einen frommen jungen Herrn."

Sein Amt als Dichter wollte Kleist am würdigsten verwalten, indem er die Welt des Sinnlichen und des Übersinnlichen harmonisch verkettete, aus der willenlosen Wahrnehmung im Traum, dem tiefen Schweigen der Sinne, das Konkrete und Zielbewusste ableitete, und die hellsten Lichtfunken aus dem dunklen Reich des Unerforschlichen entstehen liess. Ein Traumbild wird zum besten und sichersten Vorboten des wirklichen Ereignisses. Wer möchte die tiefe und klare Symbolik im "Prinz von Homburg" entbehren? Und doch hat sie immer noch nicht die gebührende Beachtung gefunden; ihr mangelhaftes Verständnis hat das üppige Gedeihen aller unnützen Erörterungsversuche verschuldet. Alle spärlichen Scenendeutungen, welche die versifizirte Handlung begleiten, sind besonders im letzten Drama von grosser Bedeutung. Der Dichter legte entschieden ein Hauptgewicht auf die Selbstkrönung des "sinnverwirrten Träumers," der nach überstandener Prüfung, nach der Sühne der leichtsinnigen Überhebung, die wirkliche Siegeskrönung des Helden von der Hand der Geliebten, mit allem strahlenden Glanz entsprechen sollte.

Wie oft, seit frühster Jugend, beschäftigte sich die Phantasie des Dichters mit dem Flechten und Winden des Ruhmeskranzes! Dieser Kranz, nach dem der Schöpfer der "Penthesilea" sich mächtig sehnte und der ihm, dem masslos Strebenden, so oft die Stirn umrauschte, wurde ihm zum Segen und zum Fluch. Tag und Nacht wollte er sich bemühen, "zu so vielen Kränzen, noch einen" auf die Kleistsche Familie herabzuringen. Zu seinem "einzigen Vergnügen" wollte er die geliebte Schwester betätigt wissen, ihm "den Kranz der Unsterblichkeit zusammen zu pflücken." Nach den höchsten Lorbeeren streben seine Helden, und erfahren fast immer wie im Augenblick, wo sich die gierige Hand nur regt, den vorüberfliegenden Ruhm "bei seinem goldnen Lockenhaar zu fassen," wie eine verhängnissvolle Macht ihnen hämisch in den Weg tritt. Was herrlich begann, droht ins Verderben zu stürzen. Selbst um den nimmer zu lösenden Freundschaftsbund mit Rühle zu verdeutlichen, greift Kleist zum Bilde des Kranzes; "dieser Kranz, er ward beim Anfang der Dinge gut gewunden, und das Band wird schon, auch ohne weiteres Zuthun, solange aushalten, als die Blumen." Und wirklich galt für den Kämpfer in der Schlacht bei Fehrbellin, die Frage, welche der Dichter an den Sieger im Kriege der bewegten Jahre, die der Schöpfung des "Prinzen von Homburg" vorangingen, stellte: "den Ruhm eines jungen und unternehmenden Fürsten, der in dem Duft einer lieblichen Sommernacht, von Lorbeeren geträumt hat."

Den verträumten Liebling belauscht der Kurfürst, wie er sich im Garten in vorgerückter Nachtstunde den Siegeskranz windet. Was für ein Laub flicht er? Laub der Weide? Nein, seltsam, beim Himmel, der Lorbeer ist's. Des jungen Toren Brust bewegt sich im fiebrigen Wahne. Sein hoher Herr "mit der Stirn des Zeus," naht sich ihm, und nimmt ihm den Kranz aus der Hand; er "schlingt seine Halskette um den Kranz und gibt ihn der Prinzessin" um dann mit einem "Geschwind! Hinweg!", mit dem dreifachen Zuruf: Ins Nichts—ins Nichts—ins Nichts, und der feierlichen Erklärung: "Im Traum erringt man solche Dinge nicht," sammt der Prinzessin Nathalie zu verschwinden. Der scheinbar harmlose Scherz hat doch seine tiefe Bedeutung. Wesshalb dieses Umschlingen des Lorbeerkranzes mit dem Golde der Kette des Staatsfürsten? Zielte der Dichter nicht auf ein Befestigen jener Heldentugenden, die noch locker und flatternd, in der Gärung der Gefühle die Brust des Jünglings bewegten? Dieser Kette, deren Glanz das Auge der sonst weitsehenden Kritiker nicht traf, gewiss ein Symbol der verbindenden nicht zu brechenden Macht des Gesetzes, wird immer wieder im Drama gedacht; dem Lorbeer einmal zugesellt, teilt sie das Loos des blättrigen Ruhmesspenders.

Lebhaft erinnert sich der Scene des Prinzen jugendlicher Freund, der Graf von Hohenzollern, selbst von der Strenge des Kurfürsten irregeleitet:

> Du, gleichsam um sein tiefstes Herz zu prüfen,
> Nahmst ihm den Kranz hinweg, die Kette schlugst du,
> Die dir vom Hals hängt, lächelnd um das Laub;
> Und reichtest Kranz und Kette, so verschlungen,
> Dem Fräulein, deiner edlen Nichte, hin.

Gleichsam um das tiefste Herz des Prinzen zu prüfen! Ja, auch der Held selbst, der schlafend und träumend, klar doch des Kurfürsten Tat erblickte, hatte die gleiche Empfindung. Sah er ja wie sein väterlicher Führer, um ihm "ganz die Seele zu entzünden," den Schmuck, der ihm vom Nacken hing, um den Lorbeerkranz schlug, und den so verschlungenen Kranz dem geliebten Mädchen reichte, "auf die Locken mir zu drücken"—"Hoch auf, gleich einem Genius des Ruhms, / Hebt sie den Kranz, an dem die Kette schwankte, / Als ob sie einen Helden krönen wollte."

Die ausgestrekte Hand sollte doch ins Leere greifen, und verflüchtigen sollte sich die herrliche Vision, "wie der Duft, der über Täler schwebt, Vor eines Windes frischem Hauch zerstiebt." Unfertig und unreif war noch der Held. Noch hatte er nicht strenge Kriegszucht und unbedingten Gehorsam gelernt. Nur einer vollkommenen Tugend gebührt die schönste Palme, jene Krone, welche der Dichter strahlend auf dem Haupte seiner Königin Louise von Preussen ruhen sah; "die Krone auch der Welt—die goldenste, die dich zur Königin der Erde macht, / Hat still die Tugend schon dir aufgedrückt." Und wir begreifen den Dichter, der den letzen Bekränzungsakt nach erfolgter Läuterung und innerer Festigung des Helden und dem Schwinden aller trügerischen Phantome des Ruhms, gerade an den Ort der anfänglichen Vision versetzt wissen wollte, wo, in stiller Abgeschiedenheit, in der grünenden Flur, lieblich die Nachtviolen, Levkojen, und Nelken dufteten, die Minne in der Seele des Helden keimte, im unbewussten Drange der glänzendste Sieg erfochten wurde. Hier nun, in lichter Sphäre und wie befreit von der Erdenlast, konnte dem Sieger aus der Hand der Geliebten der ganze Himmel entgegengebracht werden, jener Kranz, den der Dichter dem gefeierten Erzherzog Karl mit Begeisterung gewünscht:

> Und so duftet, auf welchem Gipfel
> Unverwelklich, wie er Alciden kränzet,
> Jungfrau und Lorbeer, dich, o Karl, zu krönen,
> Überwinder des Unüberwindlichen!

Was vorgeahnt, musste in Erfüllung gehen. "Jungfrau und Lorbeerkranz und Ehrenschmuck," durfte der milde Gott dem gereiften Helden kurz nach dem Tage der Schlacht schenken. Der alles adelnden, erhebenden, verklärenden Liebe ziemte es das Werk der Veredlung zu vollenden. "Die Prinzessin tritt, umgeben von Fackeln, vor den Prinzen, welcher erstaunt aufsteht; setzt ihm den Kranz auf, hängt ihm die Kette um, und drückt seine Hand an ihr Herz."

Wie konnte nur ein Gedanke an eine beabsichtige Vollstreckung des Todesurteiles seitens des Kurfürsten, nach dem schweren Vergehen des Prinzen, im Gehirne der Kritiker und Teaterregisseure Platz greifen? Verkannte man nicht dadurch die ganze erzieherische Mission des Staatsoberhauptes? Streng und mild, fest entschlossen nirgends in seinem geordneten Lande die Willkür walten zu lassen, unter der granitenen Säule des Staates keinen schwankenden Stützboden zu dulden, gleichzeitig aber die Rechte der Jugend, den begeisternden Drang zur Tat, die Macht der lieblichen Gefühle in einer Heldenbrust vollkommen anerkennend, klar in alle Seelenwirren, wie in alle Getriebe des Staats blickend, wollte er den seiner Obhut anvertrauten Jüngling dem Sturme blinder Leidenschaften entreissen, ihm die Erfüllung der strengsten aller Pflichten, die Überwindung des eigenen Mutwillens einschärfen. Zum Manne musste er ihn bilden, die schweigenden Stimmen in seinem Gewissen musste er wachrufen.

Durch Einkehr in sich selbst und das Befragen des Innern, ohne die Wirkung äusserer Triebe und Einflüsterungen, siegreich über alle Todesschauer, erfolgt die beabsichtigte Läuterung. Kein trüber Gedanke, kein Zweifel konnte die Stirne des Herrschers umdüstern. Den edlen Kern in der Natur des Prinzen hatte er wohl im dunklen Drange erkannt. Von der Macht des eigenen Übermuts hingerissen, konnte der Jüngling irren, dem Vaterlande die schwerste Kränkung beibringen,-schliesslich musste der Edelmut durchbrechen, und der rechte Weg, vom sittlichen Pflichtbewusstsein geleitet, gefunden, der Triumph "über den verderblichsten / Den Feind' in uns," den

Trotz und Übermut, glorreich errungen werden. Spricht ja der Gott im Menschen unmittelbar durch das Gefühl. Für das Gefühl des Prinzen trägt der Kurfürst—ausdrücklich will er's betonen—"die höchte Achtung . . . im Innersten." Wo anders als in uns selbst, in unserer Herzenstiefe, die Richtschnur für unser Handeln und Empfinden suchen? Seiner Wilhelmine schrieb einst der Dichter: "Ich trage eine innere Vorschrift in meiner Brust, gegen welche alle äussern, und wenn die ein König unterschrieben hätte, nichtswürdig sind," und mahnte unbesorgt dem schönsten der Triebe, der Herzensstimme zu folgen: "was Ihnen Ihr Herz sagt, ist Goldklang, und der spricht es selbst aus, dass er ächt sei." Jede Schuld ist im Grunde eine Versündigung gegen unser untrügerisches Gewissen, unser unbeirrbares Gefühl. Wehe dem, dem die unfehlbare Sicherheit des eigenen Herzens versagt, der verschmäht, mit der Goldwage der Empfindung, sein Inneres zu befragen, über sich selbst Gericht zu halten. "Über jedwedes Geständniss geht mein innerstes Gefühls doch," verkündigte bereits Eustache im ersten Schroffensteindrama. Und alle Helden Kleists, das rührende Kätchen vor Allen, erfahren wie Alles dem Zuge des Innern weichen muss, schöpfen in der höchsten Not ihre höchsten Gebote aus dem Innern, nur in ihrer Brust sehen sie die Schicksalssterne leuchten. Dämonen peitschen und zerfleischen die unglückliche Penthesilea, doch Nichts von Aussen vermag auf ihre Entschlüsse zu wirken; massgebend ist ihr Nichts als ihr töricht Herz; dem Feinde in ihrem Busen, keinem anderen Gegner, fällt sie zum Opfer, und sinkend, dem Lebenssturme entrissen, wünscht sie, man möge die Asche der Tanais in die Luft streuen und gönnt dem armen Menschenherzen sein volles Recht. Ungeheure Entschlüsse wälzt Guiskard im Busen, "doch sein Geist bezwingt sich selbst." Der Dichter selbst empfindet den tiefsten Seelenriss wie er, kurz vor seinem Sturze, den Widerspruch in sich zwischen Handlung und Gefühl wahrnimmt; alles gerät ins Schwanken, es löscht sich Stern um Stern, unser Dasein wird zur Qual: "Ach es ist ekelhaft zu leben."

Gewiss war es nicht leicht, den von seinem Liebes—und Ruhmestraum verführten Jüngling, der in entscheidender Stunde alles wagt um allein an der Spitze seiner Schaaren den Sieg herbeizuführen und sich als Held krönen zu lassen, noch im wilden, dämonischen Brausen der Leidenschaften zu bändigen, ihn zur stillen Einkehr in sich selbst, zur Verurteilung und Verdammung des eignen Frevelmuts zu bewegen. Vor seinen Augen verschwindet gleischsam der Staat, die Welt, seitdem er das erste Zeichen der Liebeshuld erhält. Siegen musste er, triumphiren über alle Feinde, koste es was es wolle. Wer vermag ihn zur Ruhe, zur Gehorsamkeit, zur Pflicht zu mahnen? Die tiefe, herrliche Vision hat gewirkt. Er ist zerstreut, geteilt, im höchsten Grade abwesend; überhört alle Befehle, die vor Schlachtanfang erteilt werden. Umsonst lässt der Kurfürst seinen Generalen den Kriegsplan verkündigen: das Heer der Schweden so in die Flucht zu drängen bis es, zersplittert vor den Brückenkopf am Rhyn gelangt, nach Sprengung der Brücke, seine gänzliche Vernichtung gefunden hätte. Umsonst wird verordnet, der Prinz solle sich in seinem angewiesenen Platz, gegenüber dem rechtem Flügel des Feindes, unbeweglich halten, vom Platz nicht weichen bis der gedrängte linke Flügel des ~~Feindes~~, aufgelöst, sich auf seinen rechten stürzt und wankend zu wilder Unordnung vor die Sümpfe gelangt wäre. Die wiederholten Befehle erschallen in die Luft. Dieses nicht eher sich Rühren als. . . stellt dem Prinzen eine unerträgliche Schranke entgegen. Die Fanfare soll er blasen lassen an einem bestimmten Zeitpunkte der Schlacht; seinem Flammengeist musste dieses Zögern des Siegesmarsches unerträglich erscheinen. Beim ersten Siegesruf der Genossen sieht er seinen eigenen Triumph gefährdet, und er bricht auf, reisst die Seinigen mit sich fort, und entscheidet den Sieg, der zwar glänzend erfochten, jedoch dem Kriegsplan und dem festgesetzten Ziele des Staatslenkers nicht entsprach.

Glück und Zufall hatten jede Kriegsweisheit und erleuchtete Vorbestimmung zu Schanden werden lassen. Und nicht persönlicher Mut, dieses Stürzen auf die Feinde gleich einer verheerenden Lavine, der zur eigensinnigen Überhebung hinzugekommene edle Drang, den todtgeglaubten Kurfürsten mit unerhörter Kampfeswut zu rächen, konnten die Schuld des Prinzen rein waschen. Das eigenmächtige Eingreifen hätte auch verhängnissvoll werden können. Entheiligt waren die Gesetze des Krieges. Willkür ersetzte die Regel, die Ordnung. Ins Herz des Vaterlandes war eine tiefe Wunde geschlagen. Nun hatte der Fürst seinem Herrn jüngst, durch Leichtsinn und Trotz, am Ufer des Rheins, zwei Siege verscherzt. Bändigen, mässigen, erziehen musste man ihn vor der erneuten Schlacht, im Zaum sollte er gehalten werden. Wiewohl als ruhmvoller Führer gewürdigt, sollte er doch Geduld üben, etwas entlegen gestellt, der Obhut und dem Rat des Obristen Kottwitz anvertraut werden. Der vom Kurfürsten empfohlenen Ruhe folgte aber die fieberhafte Überstürzung, dem "regier dich wohl" ein zügelloses Durchbrechen aller Schranken. Was Wunder, wenn der Herrscher nun, nach dieser neuen Kränkung und Missachtung des Gesetzes, der "Mutter seiner Krone," die schärfsten Mittel wählt, um endlich den unreifen, eigenwilligen Jüngling zur strengen Pflichterfüllung reifen zu lassen, wenn er das Urteil des Kriegsgerichts fordert, die Todesschatten vor den Augen des Ruhmestrunkenen gleiten, Wolken um sein Haupt sammeln lässt, und mit ungebrochenem Willen, die Erkenntniss der begangenen Tat, ein eigenes Gericht im Gewissen des Schuldigen verlangt?

Die Liebe zu dem mutigen, noch immer irregeleiteten Helden brauchte darum nicht vor dem Trotze und dem schweren Verschulden zu weichen. Sie blieb lebendig und ungeschmälert als die höchste Triebkraft in des Herrschers Brust. Und je mehr Liebe, desto grösser der Eifer des Bildens und Erziehens um zur ersehnten Vollendung zu gelangen. Wir kennen den Bildungstrieb in der Seele des Dichters, der ihn oft zum Katecheten der Menschheit machte und zum unermüdlichen Ratgeber, Prüfer und Lenker seiner geliebten Wilhelmine, unfähig mit Stürmen und Wellen zu kämpfen, hätte er nicht selbst, "mit starkem Arm," "das Steuer des Schiffers" ergriffen. Seine Liebesbriefe gestalteten sich oft zu Erziehungstractaten. Und es ist nicht ein geringes Wunder der wunderreichen Poesie Kleists, dieses Schmelzen und Verschmelzen so vieler belehrenden Elemente im goldenen Tiegel der Kunst, diese Verklärung des Unpoetischen ins Poesievolle, die nirgends erzwungene, von der Natur selbst bewirkte Wandlung des Betrachtenden ins Handelnde und Bildene, der harmonische Bund des Bewussten und des Unbewussten, das aus dem Boden des Begrifflichen erstiegene kraft- und lichtvolle Reich des Konkreten und des Fasslichen. Verhielt sich auch Kleist zu dem "allerneuesten Erziehungsplan" skeptisch und zurückhaltend, so mahnte er doch die in die Fusstapfen Fichtes und Pestalozzis tretenden Weisen sie möchten "die Jugend / Nun zu Männern" erziehen. Er machte seinen Kurfürsten zum originellsten aller Erzieher und Gewissensführer. So sicher, mit einer so unfehlbaren Erkenntnis aller Seelenkräfte hatte noch Keiner den Werdegang eines Helden bewacht und geleitet. Er durfte am Schlusse der harten Prüfung den von seinem eitlen Übermut geheilten, siegreich durch "die Schule dieser Tage durchgegangenen" jungen Helden den versammelten, um das Recht der Empfindung noch kämpfenden Offizieren als den Würdigsten der Würdigen, völlig in sich Befestigten, vorstellen und feierlich, mit unerschütterlicher Zuversicht sein: "Wollt ihr's zum vierten Male mit ihm wagen?" aussprechen.

Nur dank der strengen militärischen Zucht werden die Feinde Brandenburgs in den Staub geworfen. Eine stille Wandlung im Empfinden und im Denken des Dichters seit der ersten stürmischen Jugend war gewiss eingetreten. Einst bereute Kleist bitterlich seinen Soldatenstand; ein Offizier schien ihm ein besonders gearteter Mensch, der etwas mit seinem eigenen Wesen durchaus Unvereinbares in sich trug; mit der erlangten Freiheit atmete er auf; eine neue Sonne beschien seine Leiden und seine Freuden, ein neues Leben begann. Doch die vielen Enttäuschungen, die politischen Wirren und Kämpfe in seinem Lande, die drohende Gefahr einer Unterjochung stimmten ihn milder gegen seinen abgedankten Stand, den er in der Not noch weiter und mit entschlossenem Mut ergriffen, hätte man ihm nur den angebotenen Dienst nicht verweigert. Und fürwahr den schönsten Gewinn hätte das preussische Heer an diesem so innerlich festen, vom Schicksale so gepeinigten Dichter gehabt. Mit grösserer Wärme empfahl noch Keiner Ordnung, innere Disciplin, die unbedingte Hingabe an das leitende Gesetz, die Selbstaufopferung aller individuellen Wünsche auf dem Altar des Vaterlandes. Niemand wage es an die feste Burg des Staates zu rütteln. In den schweren Zeiten der Bedrängnis konnten die Verse des Patrioten wie Schwerthiebe wirken. Und mächtig donnerte der von der felsigen Höhe seiner thronenden Germania angestimmte Schlachtgesang ins Tal hinab. Und Flammen in die Seele der Zögernden hätte das leidenschaftliche Vaterlandsdrama mit der Verherrlichung der gewaltigen, von Liebe und Hass und Rache und Hinterlist genährten Feldherrenkunst des Befreiers der Germanen, werfen sollen.

Doch die Leier, die der Dichter zum Ruhme seines Landes so begeistert, mit so überwältigendem Gefühle schlug, rührte die Wenigsten und drohte in der Einsamkeit zu zerbrechen. Weit mildere, gedämpftere Töne hob, in geklärterer Sphäre, die patriotische Muse im neuen Drama an. Die innere Energie blieb aber ungelähmt. Noch in reicherer Fülle waren hier die Goldkörner der militärischen Weisheit ausgestreut. Ein Dichter, der mit grösster Ruhe und Verstandesschärfe Schlachtenpläne entwirft, Massen bewegt, mit der befohlenen Bedrängung und Umringung des Feindes, die das Versinken und Vernichten in den Sümpfen in der letzten Triebjagd bezwecken sollte, die geniale strategische Kunst eines Hindenburg vorwegnimmt! Dazu ein Schöpfer von so lebensvollen, wahren Charakteren wie des prächtigen in ewiger Jugendfrische lebenden Kottwitz, der, auf seine Erfahrung in der Kriegskunst gestützt, bereit ist die Tat des Prinzen, das eigenmächtige Eingreifen in die Zügel des von dem Kurfürsten geleiteten Schlachtwagens gut zu heissen, und die Rechte der Empfindung vor dem unbeugsamen, Gehorsam und Zucht fordernden Staatslenker in hinreissender Rede zu verteidigen, mühevoll das glühende Gefühl unter der harten Soldatenrinde zurückpressend, gemacht auch er, wie der Tag der Schlacht, vom hohen Herrn der Welt "zu süsserm Ding, als sich zu schlagen!"

Wiederum geraten hier im "Prinzen von Homburg" wie in der "Penthesilea" die inneren Forderungen des Individuums mit den Gesetzen und Rechten des Staates in tragischen Konflict. Ein Bezwingen des Gefühls und der brennenden Leidenschaft im Herzen der Amazone war nicht denkbar; losgelöst von den Gesetzen der Tanais, übermannt von ihrer Empfindung, musste sie zu Grunde gehen. Hebbel, der immer mächtig den zündenden Funken der Kunst Kleists in sich fühlte, und der den Zwiespalt zwischen Staat und Einzelindividuum, zwischen Gefühl und Vernunft in der "Agnes Bernauer," so bis zum Triumph der harten Notwendigkeit und der von keiner gesetzgebenden Macht jemals zu billigenden Aufopferung und Vernichtung der Unschuldigen[2] verschärfte, hätte gewiss die Kluft zwischen der Empfindungswelt des Kurfürsten und derjenigen des Prinzen erweitert, und vielleicht auch, trotz seiner Anerkennung des im Drama wundervoll dargestellten Werdegangs des Jünglings zum reifen Manne, die strengste Bestrafung, das Opfer des Schuldigen gefordert. Eine solche Gegenüberstellung der Gegensätze, ein so klares Durchblicken der Idee, ein Werden und Gedeihen auf Trümmern einer dem Untergang geweihten Welt war nicht Kleists Sache. Die grösste Spannung musste gewiss zwischen dem Leiter des Staates und dem übermütigen, dem Wahne seines Ruhmes nachjagenden Prinzen herrschen, und dunkle Schatten und düstere Wolken sollten den Himmel des verzückten, pflichtvergessenen, nur seinem Siegestraum lebenden Jünglings verfinstern; das aufbauende, immer verklärende, beseelende Werk der Liebe sollte darum keine Unterbrechung erleiden; den strengen Herrscher mit dem unbeugsamen Willen führt ein unwiderstehlicher Drang zum jungen Helden, der jugendlich die Schranke des Gesetzes durchbrochen. Ein Vater liebt den eigenen Sohn nicht minder. Sein starkes, gegen alle Pfeile gepanzertes Herz ist so voller Milde. Wehmutsvoll denken wir an das Herz des Dichters selbst. Schliesslich, ohne die geringste Überraschung seitens des Kurfürsten, erfolgt die Erkenntnis des begangenen Vergehens; die Stimme des Gewissens kann laut und mächtig sprechen; der durch diese Selbstschau in den tiefsten Seelengrund und den gefundenen Imperativ der Pflicht gänzlich umgeschaffene Held, tritt in voller Würde vor seinen Richter, ein Gleicher zu dem Gleichen, selbst im Stande seinem alten Kottwitz Kriegszucht und Gehorsam zu lehren. Alle Gegensätze schwinden. Die Welt des Kurfürsten ist eins geworden mit der Welt des Prinzen.

---

[2] Und also auch aesthetisch revoltirend, wie ich in meinem in Deutschland wenig bekannten Buche "Hebbel e i suoi drammi," Bari, 1911, S. 128 ff. nachzuweisen versuchte.

* * * * * * * *

Wir untersuchen nicht wie weit andere Dramen, die ähnliche Konflicte zwischen Liebe und Pflicht, Gefühl und Vernunft behandeln, Szenen des "Wallenstein," die Ballade Schillers "Der Kampf mit dem Drachen," die den harten Kampf in der Brust des jungen mutigen Ritters, die Selbstdemütigung nach der strengen Rückweisung des hohen das Gesetz schützenden Fürsten als Bedingung zum Erlangen des höchsten Sieges, die Überwindung und Unterdrückung des widerspenstigen Geistes, "der gegen Zucht sich frech empöret, / Der Ordnung heilig

Band zerreisst" fordert und das Flehen aller Brüder um Gnade zu Nichte macht, sowie die zur Kenntniss des Dichters gelangten sagenhaften Berichte über die Fehrbelliner Schlacht und die Überhebung eines Prinzen von Homburg, die Betrachtung alter Kupfer und Gemälde auf das Gestalten und Bilden des neuen Dramas wirken konnten. In Kleists Schaffen sind allein die aus dem Innern fliessenden Lebensquellen massgebend. Als einzige Richtschnur, wie in des Prinzen Neuumbildung, gelten die Gebote des Herzens.[3]

Wie durch eine mächtige Liebeswelle der Tatendrang des Jünglings bestimmt und geleitet, die höchste nimmer zu bewältigende Gährung der Gefühle, das titanische Anstürmen um den höchsten Schicksalskranz zu erringen, hervorgebracht wird, zeigt der Dichter, der selbst in den Zeiten seines stürmischen Begehrens um sein Alles oder Nichts kämpfte, mit packender Anschaulichkeit. Vom Glück einmal gestreift, schienen die Lockungen des Ruhms unwiderstehlich. Nicht geklärt, noch durch Edel- und Opfermut gereinigt von den Schlacken des Eigennutzes, und massloser Leidenschaftichkeit war dieses hinreissende Liebessehnen in der Brust des jungen Helden. Auch die Liebe verlangte ein Bilden und ein Erziehen. "Edler und besser sollen wir durch die Liebe werden," erfuhr einst Wilhelmine von ihrem eifrigen Herzenslenker. Dem ewig Weiblichen fiel die Rolle zu, das Werk des Verklärens, der sittlichen Reinigung zu vollenden, und so leitet die liebliche Prinzessin, ganz erfüllt von ihrer Mission, zu dem ewig Guten, ewig Schönen; dem letzten Triumph des Helden setzt sie die funkelndste Krone hinzu.

Immer gefasst, mit ruhigem, klarem innerem Blick, mit entschlossenem Mut, und dem unbeirrbaren Gefühl aller

---

[3] Will man unbedingt auch auf die Wirkung äusserer Kräfte Gewicht legen, so vergesse man nicht, wie zumeist geschieht, die Ballade Schillers. Selbst des Lindwurms ist im Drama Erwähnung gethan: "Trat er dem Lindwurm männlich nicht aufs Haupt?" (III) Unmut und Streitbegier nagten an dem Herzen des Jünglings der Ballade. "Ja selbst im Traum der stillen Nächte / Fand ich mich keuchend im Gefechte." Der Meister straft den frivolen Mut des Ritters, die Unfähigkeit: "Der Pflichten schwerste zu erfüllen, / Zu bändigen den eignen Willen. / Dich hat der eitle Ruhm bewegt." Der Ritter büsst, legt das Gewand von sich, küsst des Meisters strenge Hand und geht; liebend wird er zurückgerufen: "Umarme mich, mein Sohn! / Dir ist der härtre Kampf gelungen. / Nimm dieses Kreuz: es ist der Lohn / Der Demut, die sich selbst bezwungen."

Kleistischen Heldinnen, steht sie, als Anwalt der lieblichen Gefühle, dem Anwalt der strengen sittlichen Pflicht, mit voller Zuversicht bei. Die Welt kann ihr ja nichts anderes bieten als das Schicksal des Prinzen. Spricht man ihr von Sitte, so antwortet sie: "Die höchst' in solcher Stunde" ist den Geliebten zu lieben. Der inneren Vernichtung des Prinzen setzt sie ihre Seelenfestigkeit entgegen; und wie er niedersinkt, von Todesangst gepackt und jämmerlich um Gnade fleht, erhebt sie sich in majestätischer Ruhe und Grösse. Darf denn ein Held, der so oft im Sturm der Schlacht dem Tode ohne ein Zittern entgegenschaute, jetzt plötzlich vor einem geöffnetem Grabe mit mattem Herzen zurückweichen? "Der im Leben tausendmal gesiegt, / Er wird auch noch im Tod zu siegen wissen." Würdig an der Spitze eines Regiments zu stehen, gibt sie mit männlicher Tatkraft Befehle und Verordnungen und fügt der Macht des Gesetzes die Macht ihres Willens hinzu. Freilich musste sie auch, so gut wie die Mehrzahl der Kritiker unseres Dichters, die innerste Absicht des Oheims verkennen und einen Augenblick wenigstens an seinem unerschütterlichen Festhalten am Spruch der Kriegsgerichts irre gehen; auch sie beunruhigt in einem so milden Fürsten die Starrheit der Antike. Den Helden kränzen zunächst, dann enthaupten, "das wäre so erhaben . . . dass man es fast unmenschlich nennen könnte." Zur entscheidenden Siegeskrönung erscheint sie aber selbst, das "süsse Kind," dem strengen Manne unentbehrlich, konnte sie auch nicht ahnen, dass die Entscheidung in dem tragischen Ehrenkonflikt in der Hand des Schuldigen, nicht in der des Anklägers lag. Sie allein durfte als Bote jenes Schreibens gewählt werden, das die so unliebsam verzögerte Entscheidung fordern, das schlummernde Pflichtgewissen wecken sollte: "Willst du den Brief ihm selber überbringen?" Sie eilt, von dem früheren Anblick des Verstörten und Zerknirschten noch eingenommen, ihre Mission zu vollführen, sie wohnt mit einem Gefühl des Staunens der sittlichen Auferstehung des Geliebten bei; ein leises Beben durchzuckt sie, die ersehnte Rettung könnte noch durch ein Schwanken in der Antwort des zum eigenen Gericht Geforderten gefährdet werden; wirklich ergreift das Herz des Prinzen eine neue Regung; die überraschendste Wendung tritt wirklich ein; mit dem Bekenntnis der schweren Schuld, und dem Zurückweisen der Gnade gewinnt der Held die volle innere Festigung;

der Unbegreifliche, der Rasende, der Ungeheuerste erscheint nun in voller Würde, geadelt, gerettet, verklärt, als "süsser Freund" vor den Augen der Fürstin.

Nimm diesen Kuss!—Und bohrten gleich zwölf Kugeln
Dich jetzt in Staub, nicht halten könnt' ich mich,
Und jauchzt' und weint' und spräche: du gefällst mir.

Am Rand des Verderbens lacht sonnenumstrahlt die schönste Seelenblüte. Wer aber regelt in diesem rätselvollen Leben unser kühnes Emporsteigen und das tiefe Herabsinken? Auf den höchsten Schwingen des Glücks schien der Prinz getragen, und Triumph schrie er im Sturmesbrausen, als plötzlich sich gähnende Abgründe vor den trunkenen Augen öffnen. Dem verwegenen Rufe: "O Cäsar Divus / Die Leiter setz' ich an, an deinen Stern," donnert ein "Schuldig des Todes" drohend und vernichtend entgegen. Wer zu hoch mit titanischem Übermut gegriffen, erfährt die tiefste Erniedrigung. Die Klage über die Nichtigkeit aller Menschengüter wird aus der beklommenen Brust des von den Lockungen irdischen Glanzes und Ruhmes Hingerissenen entsteigen. Und es schwindet der Taumel des Lebens sobald die Schauer des Todes sich zeigen.

Im Grunde handelt der Prinz mit blinder Überstürzung und verkennt selbst seine eigene innere Anlage, wie er die strafende heilende Tat seines Herrschers richtet, der ihm mit der Starrheit eines Brutus, ungeheuere Entschlüsse in sich wälzend, entgegentritt. Für einen Schuft hielt er, wer sich seinem Schlachtbefehl widersetzt und befiehlt einen Offizier, der ihm unbedingten Gehorsam verweigerte, gefangen ins Hauptquartier abzuführen. Den eigenen Fehltritt begreift er nicht. Sein zu früh gewagter Angriff, dem doch ein entscheidender Sieg folgte, war er denn ein todeswürdiges Verbrechen? Und er schmachtet fassungslos in dem Kerker, nur auf Mitleid und Gnade harrend. Erst nach seiner gänzlichen Entwürdigung sollte er zur vollen Würde gelangen. Grimmig naht sich das Gespenst des Todes. Auch Egmont schüttelte dieses frühe Drängen ins finstere Schattenreich, "mitten unter Waffen, auf der Woge des Lebens": "Versagt es dir den nie gescheuten Tod vorm Angesicht der Sonne rasch zu gönnen, um dir des Grabes Vorgeschmack im eklen Moder zu bereiten?" Ein innerer Schauer durchzuckt den Helden; doch jede Zerknirschung bleibt ihm erspart; gleich rafft er sich zusammen; mutig scheidet er vom süssen Leben und schreitet dem ehrenvollen Tode entgegen.

Alle inneren Kräfte versagen indessen dem Prinzen, seitdem ihn die bleiche Furcht beschlichen. Sein Heldenherz ist geknickt. Und tiefer und immer tiefer fällt er, ein unfreundlich jammernswürdiger Anblick vor den Augen der Geliebten, welche seine Klagen um das Schwinden des Lichts des goldenen Tages hört: "O, Gottes Welt . . . ist so schön!" Das Grab hat er vor sich, und er will nichts als leben, leben um jeden Preis, wie Claudius in Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure"; "Let me live" "it is too horrible"—"the weariest and most loathed worldy life . . . is a paradise to what we fear of death." Auf Ruhm und Grösse will er Verzicht leisten. Die Liebe, die ihn entflammte und all sein Tun und Streben, das heldenmütige Stürzen in die Schlacht, bestimmte, will er nun seinem Herzen entreissen, und die Geliebte Nathalie erfährt das "Geh' ins Kloster," das Hamlet seiner Ophelia bitterlich riet: "Geh an der Main . . . ins Stift der Jungfraun." Himmelhoch, den Sternen nah, trugen ihn die Schwingen des Ruhms; nun wünscht er sich das bescheidenste Plätzchen unter den Ruhmlosen, und so ein stilles Idyll auf entlegener Erde, wie einst der Dichter selbst, nach erlittenem Schiffbruch der heissesten Ideale am Thuner See es suchte, die geistigen Güter mit den materiellen vertauschen, bauen, niederreissen, dass ihm der Schweiss herabtrieft, auf seinen Gütern am Rhein, säen, ernten, und nach der Ernte, von neuem säen, "und in den Kreis herum das Leben jagen, / Bis es am Abend niedersinkt und stirbt." Der Schlachtgesang ist verstummt, und nur ein zitterndes Lied . . . auf die Vergänglichheit aller Erdengrösse und das Schwinden im Fluge des Menschenlebens vermag die auf Wehmut und Trauer gestimmte Leier anzuschlagen.

"Ach es ist nichts ekelhafter als diese Furcht vor dem Tode," schrieb einst der Dichter seiner Wilhelmine. Nie hat aber Kleist die Darstellung des tiefsten Niederganges und des gänzlichen Zusammenbruchs der Gefühlswelt seiner Helden gescheut; ja mit sichtlicher Wollust schildert er alle Extreme der Empfindung, die höchste Verzückung, wie die grösste Fassungslosigkeit unter der zermalmenden Wucht des Schicksals. Nach dem jähen Sturz musste ein rasches, ganz unmittelbares Aufstehen und Wiederaufleben im vollsten Glanz erfolgen. Ein ernstes

Wort der Pflicht findet Zugang zum Gewissen des so verstörten Jünglings und gleich strömt vom Himmel das Licht, gleich sind alle Schatten und Gespenster verdrängt. Mit einem Schlage gelangt der Fürst zu seiner sittlichen Reife. Die höchste Lebensreife, wir wissen es, fällt im Urteil des Dichters mit der Reife zum Tode zusammen. Der Spruch des Gesetzes muss für das Heil des Staates in Erfüllung gehen. Der früher um Rettung flehte und sich an die Trümmer des gesunkenen Lebens anklammerte, sieht nun, wie Schillers Maria Stuart, wohltätig heilend den Tod nahen; den beseelenden Willen in der nun gestärkten Brust will er ausschliesslich für die Verherrlichung des heiligen Gesetzes des Krieges durch einen freien Tod verwenden. Was hat denn dieses rätselhafte Ding, das man Leben nennt, für einen anderen Preis, als das man es leicht und freudig opfern kann? Wie oft hat der Dichter diesen seinen festen Glauben ausgesprochen! "Das Leben ist viel wert, wenn man's verachtet"—"Das Leben hat doch immer nichts Erhabeneres als nur dieses, dass man es erhaben wegwerfen kann." Und neue Kräfte durchzucken die matten Glieder des wiederauferstandenen Jünglings. Er hat entbehren, entsagen gelernt. Die wiedererlangte Lebensfülle stellt er jubelnd in den Dienst der notwendig gewordenen Lebensvernichtung. "Ich bin so selig, Schwester! Überselig! Ganz reif zum Tode"—dieselbe Todesschwärmerei, welche den Dichter der "Penthesilea" unmittelbar vor seinem Ende ergriff, bemächtigt sich des Prinzen. Die Erdenschwere fällt. Alle finsteren Mächte sind gebannt. Leicht und frei erhebt sich die Seele über die Welt in die höheren Sphären. Der bangen Scheu vor dem Ungewissen folgt der freudige trunkene Blick in die bald zu lösenden Mysterien des Jenseits. Der beflügelte Geist schwingt sich durch stille Aetherräume. Mit dem Glanz einer tausendfachen Sonne strahlt den Augen des Todtgeweihten die Unsterblichkeit zu.

So sehr wir diese Wollust der Selbstaufopferung auch im Hinblick auf des Dichters eigenes Frohlocken auf "das unendliche, prächtige Grab" und den selbstgewollten Tod billigen und erhaben finden, so unnötig erscheint uns doch der Nachdruck, den der Seelenforscher auf die Einschüchterung durch das immer wieder gezeigte offene Grab legen will. Durch dieses zu deutliche Abzielen auf die gewollte Wirkung erleidet das Kunstwerk unliebsame Risse, die Auschaulichkeit, die man erhöhen möchte, wird beeinträchtigt. Es ist genug des qualvollen Gefühls, genug der Schatten, die aufgedrängt werden. Dieses Schaufeln der Erde, die das Gebein des gefallenen Helden empfangen und decken soll, widert uns schliesslich an und hätte leicht dem so tief gesunkenen Prinzen erspart werden können. Die Feuerprobe, welche der Graf von Gleichen von seinem Kätchen mit übertriebener, fast grausamer Härte erfordert, um zum glanzvollsten Triumph der Tugend zu gelangen, wiederholt sich hier im Drama der aufgezwungenen Selbstzucht. Nur Schade, dass dem Kurfürsten die Grabkunst Michelangelos, die von dem Gewaltigen zur Verdammung des eitlen Menschenruhms gebrauchten Sinnbilder menschlicher Hinfälligkeit, nicht zur Verfügung standen. Die militärischen strengsten Bestimmungen sollten helfen. Mit dem Bilde der offenen Gruft wetteifert das Bild des von den strafenden Kugeln zu Todgetroffenen. Schon sind auf dem Markte die Fenster bestellt, "die auf das öde Schauspiel niedergehn." Der eifrigste Verteidiger des Prinzen wird ausserwählt, "mit seinen zwölf Schwadronen / Die letzten Ehren zu erweisen." Ein Regiment soll bestellt sein den Versenkten "aus Karabinern, überm Grabeshügel / Versöhnt die Totenfeier" zu halten. Sollte wirklich aus dem Übermass der Liebe des Kurfürsten dieses Übermass von drohender Härte fliessen?

Nach der erfochtenen Schlacht sehen wir alle Kräfte des Herrschers verwendet, um die Unwandlung des Prinzen, den Sieg über den verhängnissvollen Trotz und Mutwillen herbeizuführen. Vor dieser Pflicht der Erziehung eines unbesonnen stürmischen Jünglings zum wahren, des Kranzes wirklich würdigen Helden, treten alle Staatsgedanken und Geschäfte zurück. Und wenig bedeuten noch die einzelnen Fälle der Insubordination, die sich im Kreise der um das Schicksal des Prinzen besorgten Offiziere wiederholen. Eine gelinde Rüge genügte um sie zu beseitigen. Wie in allen vom Dichter ersonnenen Herrschernaturen treten Schroffheit und Unbeugsamkeit des Willens zusammen mit der grössten Feinheit und Zartheit des Empfindens. "Gott schuf nichts Milderes als ihn," beteuert die liebliche Nathalie, die von ihrem mächtigen Beschützer mit den Koseworten: "mein süsses Mädchen" "süsses Kind," "mein liebes Kind," "mein Töchterchen," "mein Nichtchen," angesprochen wird. Und Milde erkannte man auch in dem gotterleuchteten, alle Mittel und Greuel der Bekämpfung, Mord und Brand nicht scheuenden Retter und Befreier der Germanen. "Der Frühling kann nicht milder sein." Als Fürst wohl, aber auch mit väterlicher Fürsorge liebte der Brandenburger Herrscher den jungen Stürmer: "Ich bin ihm wert, das weiss ich / Wert wie ein Sohn." Und wie andächtig und liebevoll blickte der Prinz zu seinem Herrscher empor; wie pries er die Tat des in Staub gesunkenen Froben, dieses Opfers seiner Treue! Hätte er zehn Leben, könnte er sie nicht besser brauchen als so. Den Irrungen des Verblendeten musste das unbeirrbare, durch keine Macht ins Schwanken zu bringende Vorgehen des weisen Lenkers entgegengestellt werden.

Dass der Kurfürst mit einem Unfertigen und immer noch in Gärung Begriffenen zu tun hatte, der ihm in der wichtigsten Schlacht noch einen tollen Streich spielen könne, wusste er wohl. Auch zweifelte er nicht im Geringsten, dass die beabsichtigte Wendung im Gewissen des Schuldigen erfolgen würde. Seine Erkenntnisschärfe konnte keinem argen Trug unterliegen. Eine Entwicklung zur vollen Geistesfreiheit konnte nur unter eigener Verantwortung vor sich gehen. Und eigenmächtig im tiefsten Innern keimt im Menschen das Pflichtgefühl. Wie bedacht ist der Dichter, Richter und Gerichteten von einander zu trennen und sie solange auseinanderzuhalten bis der Prozess des Selbsturteilens und des Selbstentscheidens zur Vollendung gelangt! Kein Wort zwischen ihnen darf vorher gewechselt werden. Und nicht im Entferntesten gedenkt der Kurfürst in seinen Schreiben an den Prinzen zur Pflicht zu mahnen; genug wenn er selbst kein Verschulden gegen das innere, alles regierende und bestimmende Müssen begeht. "Darf ich den Spruch . . . unterdrücken?" Dass die Haft den Prinzen, statt ihn zu ernster Besinnung zu bringen, so erbärmlich feige macht, scheint sein eigenes Gefühl einen Augenblick zu beirren. Ein Held, der um Gnade fleht, muss ja sein höchstes Erstaunen erregen. Wird ihm selbst, dem Prüfer, nicht eine schwere Prüfung zubereitet? Ein anderer Dichter hätte gewiss dem Schmerz des erfahrenen Mannes in gesonderten Selbstgesprächen Ausdruck verliehen. Bei Kleist, wo Alles auf die Handlung, auf die Tat, auf die Charakter-und Lebensgestaltung hinausläuft, sind derartige Ergiessungen müssig. Ein Hindeuten mit lapidarischer Kürze ersetzt alle Auseinandersetzungen. Die Kunst ist Fasslichkeit und Prägnanz. Oft leisten die Kleistischen Helden im Verschweigen ihr Höchstes.

Gewähren wir dem Kurfürsten nebst anderen Gaben auch die der weisen, immer zum gefassten Ziel führenden Strategik. Wer so die Menschen in seiner Macht hat, mit Adlerblick erhaben über Alles sieht, darf sich mitunter auch in der strengsten Ausübung seiner Pflicht einen Scherz, ein Verstellungsspiel als Zeichen seiner Überlegenheit gestatten. Wir wissen, wie auch in der Kunst der Täuschung die Grösse Hermanns als Führer der Germanen sich bekundet. Die ungemein klare Auffassung der Dinge, die Kenntniss der seelischen Vorgänge teilt ja der Fürst mit Niemanden in seiner Umgebung; und so kann er, ohne besondere Rednerkunst, bloss gefasst "auf märk'sche Weise," die Weisheit Aller überflügeln und gelegentlich verwirren. Die Gesinnung seiner Treusten lernt er am Besten und am Tiefsten durch sein Verharren als gnadenloser Urteilsvollstrecker, und die Maske des grausamen Richters, die er trägt, kennen, während doch in seinem Innern nur Milde, nur Güte herrscht. Nur so konnte er in seinem Lebensherbst die schwungvolle Rede von Kottwitz als Verteidiger der scheinbar verletzten Rechte des Gefühles veranlassen, die höchste Spannung im Kreise seiner Untertanen bewirken, dem staatschützenden Gesetz die grösste unverlierbare Kraft und Würde verleihen. Ein tragisches Spielen fürwahr mit dem Verbluten der stärksten Seele, keine Komödie; und wir begreifen die Bedrängniss der Mitleidenden an dem Spiele: "O Gott der Welt! Musst' es bis dahin kommen?"

Er allein, der Herrscher, wiewohl er gewissenhaft vor den wichtigsten Entschlüssen all die Seinigen um sich sammelt, und mit einem "was meint ihr?" ihren Rat fordert, waltet über das Schicksal seines Landes, und schlichtet mit fester Hand und unfehlbarem Instinkt Sorgen und Kämpfe. Der Graf von Hohenzollern bleibt im Glauben sein Wort fiele, "ein Gewicht, in seine Brust." Nichts als die eigene Stimme des Gewissens ist aber entscheidend. Und wo der Fürst in seine Herzenstiefe greift, findet er seinen belebenden Gott. An seiner Lebensneige, kann er immer noch das frische Wagen, das warme Fühlen, das Sehnen der Jugend im Blühen des Lenzes mitempfinden. Und so wird ihm vergönnt die vollste Harmonie zwischen der Gefühlswelt und der Welt des Verstandes zu erzielen, so vermag er die gelöschten Sterne in der Brust seines Lieblings zu entzünden und den Gereiften so fest an sich zu ziehen, dass ein Seelenaustausch erfolgen kann, und der Prinz zum besten Sachwalter wird, der des hohen Herren Sache führt.

Ein Kuss auf die Stirne des Helden besiegelt den nun unzertrennlichen Bund. Das Herz bebt. Wie prächtig war das Werk gelungen! Mit welcher Manneswürde trat ihm der Jüngling entgegen! Wie überragte er, selbst an Verstand und Strenge des Pflichtbewusstseins, die besten und erfahrungsreichsten der Führer! Doch die Verstellungskunst sollte weiter geübt werden. Zurückhaltend noch im Anschwellen der Gefühle sprach der Herrscher von der Bewilligung der letzten Bitte. Dann aber bereitet er den höchsten Triumph des Lebens mitten in der höchsten Todesverzückung des Geheilten. Und er reicht den Kranz mit der nie zu brechenden Kette der Prinzessin, die als Anwalt der Liebe die feierliche Krönung des Helden vollführt. Ein Donnern der Kanonen, ein mächtiges: "In Staub mit allen Feinden," die Siegessymphonie eines Kleist brauchte keine anderen Töne. Neue Zeiten dämmern. In voller Ordnung und Eintracht, innerlich gefestigt, schreitet das Vaterland seinen künftigen Schicksalen entgegen.

Sein Dichter aber, mit dem Tod im Herzen, entzieht sich dem feierlichen Gang. Das Leben bereitet ihm nur Qual und Leiden, und er scheidet, wagt den oft ersonnenen Wurf; sinkt ungebeugt wie die Eiche "weil sie zu stolz und kräftig blühte." Und wir denken erschüttert an diesen Sturz. War er nicht selbst der Zauberer, der die entgegengesetzten Welten harmonisch zu verbinden verstand, und das Leidenschaftliche, Himmelstürmende der Jugend nahe an die Sterne göttlicher Weisheit rückte? Der das Herbe und Strenge der sittlichen Pflicht mit dem lieblichsten Schmelz der Gefühle und der rührendsten Zärtlichkeit im Bunde mit der keuschesten Liebe zur schönsten Entfaltung und innigstem Zusammenwirken brachte? Wer sonst noch vermochte in die gedrungenste Darstellung der Seelenkonflicte so viel Anmut, in eine so wortkarge Kunst so viel Weichheit und Empfindungsfülle hineinzuzaubern, den Traum des Weltentrückten so lieblich und täuschend mit dem Ereignis des wachen Lebens mitten im Weltgetümmel zu verketten; wer Dämonen und Götter im

Gewimmel der Erscheinungen dieses wunderlichen, gebrechlichen Erdenreiches, im raschen Zerstieben des Glückstraums der Menschen in so tiefen Einklang tätig nebeneinander zu erdenken; wer das Schreckliche selbst und scheinbar Widerwärtige so mit poetischem Glanz zu verklären? Wohl hat das lange Verweilen und Sinnen im Reich des Unbewussten diese geheimnissvolle Macht in dem Dichter und Träumer entwickelt. Er, der ewig unbegriffene, unselige Mensch, der einst nach dem höchsten Kranz der Dichtung strebte, durfte alle Erdengüter gering schätzen, gefasst sein eitel Nichts aussprechen—"wir begegnen uns, drei Frühlinge lieben wir uns, und eine Ewigkeit fliehen wir auseinander"—nur den Gesang, der aus der freien Brust, so mächtig, so voll unnennbaren Wonnen strömte, behorchen, und singend, frei wie der Vogel singt, sich losgelöst von allen Banden fühlen. Der Todespfeil traf, und das Lied verstummte in der zerschmetterten Brust. Und sterbend nahm der Dichter mit sich auf die Fluren der Seligen das Geheimniss seines so kräftigen und zugleich so süssen Liedes.

ARTURO FARINELLI

Torino, Italy

BURKE'S ESSAY ON THE SUBLIME AND ITS REVIEWERS

Burke's *Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* has often been reprinted, and almost always, since the second edition of January 10, 1759,[1] 'with an Introductory Discourse concerning Taste, and several other Additions.' A comparison with the original edition, published by Dodsley on April 21, 1757,[2] shows that most of the changes were merely verbal and of a minor sort; these casual differences Burke, in his second Preface, passes over in silence—and for the present we may follow his example. Nothing of importance is either deleted or rewritten. There are, however, considerable additions. The significant changes, then, consist of a new Preface, an introductory essay on taste, and, in the text proper, scattered additional passages in sum larger by half than the treatise on taste.

The original Preface recounts the manner in which the *Inquiry* came to be written; it briefly describes the common confusion of mind upon the subject-matter of the essay, and the author's method of inquiry:

> He observed that the ideas of the sublime and beautiful were frequently confounded, and that both were indiscriminately applied to things greatly differing, and sometimes of natures directly opposite. Even Longinus, in his incomparable discourse upon a part of this subject, has comprehended things extremely repugnant to each other under one common name of the sublime. The abuse of the word beauty has been still more general, and attended with still worse consequences.
>
> Such a confusion of ideas must certainly render all our reasonings upon subjects of this kind extremely inaccurate and inconclusive. Could this admit of any remedy, I imagined it could only be from a diligent examination of our passions in our own breasts, from a careful survey of the properties of things which we find by experience to influence those passions, and from a sober and attentive investigation of the laws of nature, by which those properties are capable of affecting the body and thus of exciting our passions.[3]

The second Preface is altogether new, both in phrase and in idea; it omits any account of the origin of the work, but mentions the changes in the second edition, and discusses, this time more technically, the method of investigation and its uses:

---

[1] Ralph Straus, *Robert Dodsley, Poet, Publisher, and Playwright*, 1910, p. 367.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

[3] *Inquiry*, 1757, pp. vi-vii.

> In considering any complex matter, we ought to examine every distinct ingredient in the composition, one by one, and reduce everything to the utmost simplicity; since the condition of our nature binds us to a strict law and very narrow limits. We ought afterwards to re-examine the principles by the effect of the composition, as well as the composition by that of the principles. We ought to compare our subject with things of a similar nature, and even with things of a contrary nature; for discoveries may be and often are made by the contrast, which would escape us on the single view. . . . The use of such inquiries may be very considerable. Whatever turns the soul inward on itself tends to concentre its forces and to fit it for greater and stronger flights of science.[4]

The more positive tone of the second Preface reflects the favor with which the first edition had been received. On August 10, 1757, Burke wrote to Shackleton, a former schoolmate:

> This letter is accompanied by a little performance of mine, which I will not consider as ineffectual if it contributes to your amusement. It lay by me for a good while, and I at last ventured it out. It has not been ill received, so far as a matter on so abstracted a subject meets with readers.[5]

David Hume, indeed, in spite of his interest in literary and aesthetic questions, which in 1757 led him to publish a dissertation on taste, and another on tragedy,[6] was not among the early readers; it was not until after the second edition that he mentioned to Adam Smith, in a letter of April 12, 1759, his acquaintance with "Burke, an Irish gentleman, who wrote lately a very pretty treatise on the sublime."[7] That Burke's original edition was not ill-received may be seen from three contemporary reviews, by Arthur Murphy in Johnson's *Literary Magazine*,[8] by an unknown writer in the *Critical Review*,[9] *and* by Oliver Goldsmith in the *Monthly Review*.[10] The *London Chronicle*[11] carried an account of the *Inquiry* which was spread over five issues, but Dodsley was its publisher, and the review largely consisted of quotations. Yet it is noteworthy that even Dodsley's reviewer did not subscribe to Burke's theory, and was struck, not so much by the soundness of the *Inquiry*, as by its "bold uncommon spirit" and its giving "criticism a face which we never saw it wear before."[12]

---

[4] *Inquiry*, 1761, pp. v, viii; *Works* 1.58, 60. (In this paper, I cite as *Works* the six-volume edition published in the *World's Classics Series* by the Oxford University Press, 1906.)

[5] *Works and Correspondence of Burke*, 1852, 1.17.

[6] In *Four Dissertations*.

[7] Burton, *Life and Correspondence of Hume*, 2.55.

[8] *Literary Magazine* 2.182-189 (1757). This review was ascribed by Thomas Davies to Samuel Johnson, and was inserted in the first edition of Johnson's works (1787; vol. 10) by Sir John Hawkins; but Boswell ascribed it to Murphy. It is not included in the edition of Johnson's works published in 1792 with an introduction by Murphy. (W. P. Courtney, *Bibliography of Samuel Johnson*, p. 77; Boswell's *Life*, ed. by G. B. Hill, 1.310.)

[9] *Critical Review* 3.361-374 (April, 1757).

Murphy, the most severe of the three reviewers who attempted serious criticism, said:

> Upon the whole, though we think the author of this piece mistaken in his fundamental principles, and also in his deductions from them, yet we must say we have read his book with pleasure. He has certainly employed much thinking; there are many ingenious and elegant remarks which, though they do not enforce or prove his first position, yet considering them detached from his system, they are new and just. And we cannot dismiss this article without recommending a perusal of the book to all our readers, as we think they will be recompensed by a great deal of sentiment, [and] perspicuous, elegant, and harmonious style, in many passages both sublime and beautiful.[13]

The unknown writer in the *Critical Review* remarked that on a subject so abstruse he could give, not a critique, but a short review of the work, proposing some doubts without impugning the theory,[14] and heartily recommending the book as "a performance superior to the common level of literary productions as much as real ingenuity is superior to superficial petulance, and the fruit of mature study to the hasty produce of crude conjecture."[15] Goldsmith, though he vigorously contested Burke's theory, was yet the most cordial of the three. His summary very largely borrowed Burke's phrasing, his objections he relegated to footnotes, and he said:

> Our author thus, with all the sagacity so abstruse a subject requires, with all the learning necessary to illustration of his system, and with all the genius that can render disquisition pleasing—by proceeding on principles not sufficiently established, has been only agreeable when he might have been instruc-

---

[10] *Monthly Review* 16.473-480 (May, 1757). The ascription to Goldsmith is found in Prior, *Life of Oliver Goldsmith*, 1837, pp. 226 ff.

[11] *London Chronicle* 1.556-8, 580-581, 595-596; 2.26-27, 50-53 (June 9-11, 16-18, 21-23; July 7-9, 14-16).

[12] *Ibid.*, 2.52.

[13] *Literary Magazine* 2.189.

[14] *Critical Review* 3.374.

[15] *Ibid.*, 3.361.

> tive. . . . If we have, in a very few instances, attempted to point out any mistake or oversight in this very agreeable author's principles, not a captious spirit of controversy, but concern for truth, was the motive; and the ingenious Inquirer, we are persuaded, is too much a philosopher to resent our sometimes taking a different course in pursuit of the game he has started.[16]

These notices, perhaps, together with the need for a new edition, encouraged Burke in his second Preface to omit the following remark in his first:

> He now ventures to lay it before the public, proposing his notions as probable conjectures, not as things certain and indisputable.[17]

True, in the later Preface, Burke did allude to the possibility of errors in his work and even of failure, but he asserted also, perhaps a little impatiently:

> A theory founded on experiment and not assumed, is always good for so much as it explains. Our inability to push it indefinitely is no argument at all against it.[18]

This last remark, with the rest of its paragraph, evidently was evoked by the critics, whose practice it was "to pass over both the premises and conclusion in silence, and to produce, as an objection, some poetical passage which does not seem easily accounted for upon the principles I endeavor to establish."[19] This offense had been committed by all three reviewers, and in making the same point, that terror and pain are not the only sources of the sublime, nor sources of that alone.[20]

In his second Preface, Burke gives no explanation for the introduction of the *Discourse on Taste* other than by saying:

> It is a matter curious in itself, and it leads naturally enough to the principal inquiry.[21]

It is not within the design of this paper to discuss the origins of the *Discourse;* yet it may not be amiss to point out here that the year 1757 saw the appearance of Hume's *Dissertation on Taste,*[22] and that of the seventh volume of the *Encyclopédie,* which contained the article *Goût.* This article, by Voltaire,

---

[16] *Monthly Review* 16.473, 480.

[17] *Inquiry,* 1757, p. viii.

[18] *Inquiry,* 1761, p. vii; *Works* 1.59.

[19] *Inquiry,* 1761, p. vi; *Works* 1.59.

[20] *Monthly Review* 16.475; *Critical Review* 3.363; *Literary Magazine* 2.183.

[21] *Inquiry,* 1761, p. iii; *Works* 1.57.

[22] In *Four Dissertations.*

Montesquieu, and D'Alembert, was later translated as an appendix to Gerard's *Essay on Taste*,[23] and Burke included a partial translation of Montesquieu's treatise in the first volume of the *Annual Register* (that for 1758). Gerard's essay was written in competition for the gold medal offered in 1756 by the Edinburgh Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, and Agriculture.[24] It would be interesting to know who were the unsuccessful competitors of Gerard.

The changes in the body of the work fully justify the words of Burke in the Preface to the second edition:

> Though I have not found sufficient reason, or what appeared to me sufficient, for making any material changes in my theory, I have found it necessary in many places to explain, illustrate, and enforce it.[25]

Virtually all the explanations and enforcements were called forth by the opinions expressed in the three reviews. The additions, then, represent Burke's side of a debate with his reviewers. It would hardly be profitable to try to discriminate finally and in every case the influence of each of these upon Burke's additions. For a number of changes, it is clear that more than one criticism is responsible. The most important suggestions—or, rather, occasions for rebuttal—concerning the first two parts, are Goldsmith's; he was aided chiefly by Murphy. The expansion of the sections on proportion in the third part was chiefly called forth by the objections of the writer in the *Critical Review*, as were also the few additions to the fourth part. Murphy's remarks brought the relatively large additions to the short final part on words. Save for the strictures of Goldsmith, Burke did not try to meet every objection.

We may first attend to the changes occasioned by the criticisms of Goldsmith. He first objects to Burke's distinction between positive pleasure and the feeling we experience upon the removal or moderation of pain, and thus states his objection:

> Our author imagines that positive pleasure operates upon us by relaxing the nervous system, but that delight [on the removal of pain] acts in a quite contrary manner. Yet it is evident that a reprieve to a criminal often affects him with such pleasure that his whole frame is relaxed, and he faints away

---

[23] 1759.

[24] *Advertisement* prefixed to Gerard's *Essay*, 1759.

[25] *Inquiry*, 1761, p. iii; *Works* 1.57.

> Here then a diminution of pain operates just as pleasure would have done, and we can see no reason why it may not be called pleasure.[26]

This argument, which Murphy also advanced,[27] Burke meets with the remark:

> It is most certain that every species of satisfaction or pleasure, how different soever in its manner of affecting, is of a positive nature in the mind of him who feels it. The affection is undoubtedly positive; but the cause may be, as in this case it certainly is, a sort of privation. And it is very reasonable that we should distinguish by some term two things so distinct in nature as a pleasure that is such simply, and without any relation, from that pleasure which cannot exist without a relation, and that too a relation to pain.[28]

Goldsmith's next objection concerns a principal part of Burke's theory, namely that the ideas of pain and danger are the ultimate sources of the sublime, as the strongest emotion which the mind is capable of feeling.

> Our author, by assigning terror for the only source of the sublime, excludes love, admiration, etc. But to make the sublime an idea incompatible with those affections is what the general sense of mankind will be apt to contradict. It is certain we can have the most sublime ideas of the Deity without imagining him a God of terror. Whatever raises our esteem of an object described must be a powerful source of sublimity; and esteem is a passion nearly allied to love.[29]

This last sentence drew from Burke the frequently quoted dictum that "love approaches much nearer to contempt than is commonly imagined."[30] Burke illustrates and enforces his original statement as to the relation of terror and sublimity with the words:

> I am satisfied the ideas of pain are more powerful than those which enter on the part of pleasure. Without all doubt, the torments which we may be made to suffer are much greater in their effect on the body and mind than any pleasures which the most learned voluptuary could suggest. . . . Nay, I am in great doubt whether any man could be found who would earn a life of the most perfect satisfaction, at the price of ending it in the torments which justice inflicted in a few hours on the late unfortunate regicide in France.[31]

To strengthen the argument by alluding to the regicide in France was natural enough if Burke was making his corrections shortly after the appearance of the three reviews. Murphy, indeed, had suggested it by the remark, left unanswered by Burke, that "the iron bed of Damiens [is] capable of exciting alarming ideas of terror, but cannot be said to hold anything of the sublime."[32] Damiens unsuccessfully attempted the life of Louis XV on January 5, 1757, and after other tortures was put to death by *écartèlement* on March 28 of the same year.[33] The *Monthly Review* for May, 1757, referred to two lives of the regicide, but refused to review either, on the ground that "we have seen enough of Damiens already in the newspapers." A later number[34] gave a detailed account of the trial and the torture.

---

[26] *Monthly Review* 16.474-475.

[27] *Literary Magazine* 2.183.

[28] *Inquiry* 1.4; 1761, pp. 52-53; *Works* 1.88. The addition runs one sentence farther than the quotation above.

[29] *Monthly Review* 16.475.

[30] *Inquiry* 2.5; 1761, p. 116; *Works* 1.117.

[31] *Inquiry* 1.7; 1761, p. 59; *Works* 1.91. The addition runs from the first sentence quoted to one after the last quoted.

Goldsmith's sentence already quoted, alleging that we can have sublime ideas of the Deity without supposing him a god of terror, was by Burke made the occasion of part of another and eloquent addition, the section on power.[35] Burke held that to the human imagination, the power of the Deity is the most striking of his attributes. This view he supported with quotations from Horace, Lucretius, and the Scriptures. Thus the second half of the section on power (the whole appeared for the first time in the enlarged edition) finds its cause in the reviewer's allusion to the Deity. If reflection on the force of Goldsmith's remarks had not been sufficient to incite Burke to the account, in the first half of the inserted section, of the general idea of power as a cause of the sublime, a phrase in the *Critical Review* might well have done so:

> We impute the idea of the sublime to the impression made on the fancy by an object that indicates power and greatness.[36]

Still attacking Burke's fundamental separation of the sublime and the beautiful on the basis of pain and pleasure, Goldsmith had cited an instance in which painful and pleasant ideas are mingled:

> When, after the horrors of a tempestuous night, the Poet hails us with a

---

[32] *Literary Magazine* 2.183.

[33] *La Grande Encyclopédie.*

[34] *Monthly Review* 17.57.

[35] *Inquiry* 2.5. The addition of a whole section explains the two sections numbered 4 in this Part.

[36] *Critical Review* 3.369.

> description of the beauties of the morning, we feel double enjoyment from the contrast. Our pleasure here must arise from the beautiful or the sublime.[37]

Goldsmith had proceeded to overthrow his author's fundamental separation of the causes of these two on each hypothesis. The *Critical Review*, too, had more curtly refused to accept the division.[38] Accordingly, Burke took a hint from Murphy's remark[39] that "the sublime will exist with beauty," and said:

> In the infinite variety of natural combinations, we must expect to find the qualities of things the most remote imaginable from each other united in the same object. . . . If the qualities of the sublime and beautiful are sometimes found united, does this prove that they are the same? Does it prove that they are any way allied? Does it prove even that they are not opposite and contradictory?[40]

Goldsmith's next point of attack was Burke's view of the relation between indistinctness of imagery and sublimity. Burke's theory, that clearness is always detrimental to emotional effect, may have been among the opinions that led Arthur Murphy to say:

> The love of novelty seems to have been a very leading principle in his mind throughout his whole composition; and we fear that in endeavoring to advance what was never said before him, he will find it his lot to have said what will not be adopted after him.[41]

Goldsmith refrained from a like censure, and even granted that obscurity sometimes produces the sublime, as indeed did Murphy also.[42] Goldsmith merely said:

> Distinctness of imagery has ever been held productive of the sublime. The more strongly the poet or orator impresses the picture he would describe upon his own mind, the more apt will he be to paint it on the imagination of his reader. Not that, like Ovid, he should be minute in description. . . . We only think the bold yet distinct strokes of a Virgil far surpass the equally bold yet confused ones of Lucan.[43]

Burke did not attempt to deal with these arguments merely in the passage against which they were directed.[44] To this he added a paragraph in which he argued that a clear idea, being readily perceived, "is therefore another name for a little idea," and that painters, in picturing scenes of horror, had achieved only "odd, wild grotesques"; and he quoted the vision of Job as an instance of moving indistinctness. To the section on Magnificence,[45] Burke added an instance of numerous confused images in a passage from Shakespeare, and another from Ecclesiasticus; and to the section on Light[46] was added a quotation from Milton illustrating the "power of a well-managed darkness."

---

[37] *Monthly Review* 16.475.

[38] *Critical Review* 3.366.

[39] *Literary Magazine* 2.188.

[40] *Inquiry* 3.27; 1761, pp. 238-9; *Works* 1.172-173. The addition runs from the first sentence quoted to the end of the section.

[41] *Literary Magazine* 2.183.

[42] *Ibid.*, 2.185.

[43] *Monthly Review* 16.477.

[44] *Inquiry* 2.[4]; 1761, pp. 107-110; *Works* 1.114-115. The addition is the last paragraph.

The paradoxical defense of obscurity may be thought to spring from Burke's preference for an idealistic to a realistic art, but one need only refer to his idea of imitation, expressed in the introduction,[46a] to see that his was by no means an idealistic theory of art. Burke really derives his paradox on obscurity from a rhetorician's examination of the human passions, as is evident from Part V of the *Inquiry*. The limitations of Burke's theory are made clear by contrast with Reynolds' well-known papers in the *Idler*[46b] published some months after Burke's enlarged edition. In these papers, it will be recalled, Reynolds prefers the Italian painters to the Dutch, because the Italians attend "only to the invariable, the great and general ideas which are fixed and inherent in universal nature; the Dutch . . . to literal truth and a minute exactness in the detail."[46c] The opposition of the invariable idea, inherent in universal nature, to the accidental, is not parallel to Burke's opposition of the great or obscure to the little or clear. The extent of Reynolds' debt to Burke and Johnson has been disputed, but, in the passage here quoted, there need be no question: Reynolds owes his idea of the invariable to his friend Mudge,[46d] who taught him Plato.[46e]

[45] *Inquiry* 2.13; 1761, pp. 141-143; *Works* 1.128-129. The addition begins "There are also many descriptions" and runs to the end of the section.

[46] *Inquiry* 2.14; 1761, pp. 145-147; *Works* 1.130-131. The addition begins "Our great poet" and runs to the end of the section.

[46a] *Inquiry*, 1761, pp. 15–16; *Works*, 1.72. *Inquiry* 1. 16, which is formally on imitation, adds nothing to the definition.

[46b] Nos. 76, 79, 82; Sept. 29, Oct. 20 and Nov. 10, 1759.

[46c] No. 79.

[46d] Northcote, *Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, 1. 113–115. Northcote relies on Burke's letter of 1797 to Malone.

[46e] I owe to Professor H. S. V. Jones the suggestion of a comparison with Reynolds, as also the reference to Ruskin's interesting qualifications on Reynolds' opinion: *Modern Painters* 3.4.1, ed. Cook and Wedderburn, 5.20 ff.

Another objection of Goldsmith's was to Burke's account of beauty as the cause of love. In a passage[47] somewhat confused in its terms, the reviewer held that love, or a sense of beauty, is not always caused by the mere physical aspect of objects, but by our reasonings as to the fitness of their structure for our uses or for their own; and he cited friendship as a kind of love based rather on interest than on physical attraction. Murphy[48] agreed with Goldsmith, but the writer in the *Critical Review* approved Burke's rejection of utility as an element of beauty.[49] Burke strengthened his refutation of the argument that fitness is a cause of beauty, by adding[50] several instances of fit animals that yet are not considered beautiful, and defended his limitation of the term[51] to "the merely sensible qualities of things" on the ground of "preserving the utmost simplicity" in a difficult and complex subject.

In his last note, Goldsmith brought his incomplete knowledge of medicine to bear on Burke's explanation of the manner in which darkness affects the eye. Burke, of course, consistently with his whole theory, held that darkness is terrible; and in Part IV, in which he explained the efficient—that is, the physical—causes of the sublime and of the beautiful, he had to show how darkness is painful to the eye. This he did by referring to the painful contraction of the radial fibres of the iris as the pupil dilates; and this painful contraction or tension he opposed to relaxation, which he called pleasant. Goldsmith said in objection:

> The muscles of the uvea act in the contraction, but are relaxed in the dilatation of the ciliary circle. Therefore, when the pupil dilates, they are in a state of relaxation, and the relaxed state of a muscle is its state of rest. . . . Hence darkness is a state of rest to the visual organ, and consequently the obscurity which he justly remarks to be often a cause of the sublime, can affect the sensory by no painful impression; so that the sublime is often caused by a relaxation of the muscles as well as by a tension.[52]

---

[47] *Monthly Review* 16.476.

[48] *Literary Magazine* 2.187.

[49] *Critical Review* 3.367.

[50] *Inquiry* 3.6; 1761, pp. 193-195; *Works* 1.152-153. The addition begins 'I need say little on the trunk of the elephant' and ends 'not very different from men and beasts.'

[51] *Inquiry* 3.1; 1761, pp. 162-163; *Works* 1.138-139. The new matter includes all save the first three sentences of the section.

[52] *Monthly Review* 16.480.

Burke strengthened his original position by showing that the antagonist muscles, the radial fibres of the iris, are forcibly drawn back by the relaxation of the iris; and he alluded to the common experience of pain in trying to see in a dark place.[53]

Forster in his life of Goldsmith has thus described the article in the *Monthly Review:*

> His criticism was elaborate and well-studied; he objected to many parts of the theory, and especially to the materialism on which it founded the connection of objects of pleasure with a necessary relaxation of the nerves; but these objections, discreet and thoroughly considered, gave strength as well as relish to its praise, and Burke spoke to many of his friends of the pleasure it had given him.[54]

The critical part of this description is not more correct than the last statement is substantiated. The review itself was avowedly a bundle of extracts, the criticism was contained in but five footnotes, and Goldsmith's chief objection was not to the author's materialism, but to his strict division of the sublime and beautiful on the basis of pain and pleasure; all his comments on the relation of pleasure and relaxation are to this end.

Subtly ambiguous!

Goldsmith had ranged with Burke over a wide field of fact and deduction, but not without leaving much unsaid. The writer in the *Critical Review* directed his objections chiefly to the relation of proportion and beauty. Murphy had dismissed Burke's reasons for not considering proportion a cause of beauty by referring to the authorities, "Hutchinson and others," saying at the same time that the "gradual variation"[55] Burke found beautiful was simply another name for proportion. This comment of Murphy drew from Burke an allusion to Hogarth's *Analysis of Beauty* which requires explanation. Burke's words are:

> It gives me no small pleasure to find that I can strengthen my theory in this point [that gradual variation is necessary to beauty] by the opinion of the very ingenious Mr. Hogarth, whose idea of the line of beauty I take in general to be extremely just. . . . I must add, too, that, . . . though the varied line is that alone in which complete beauty is found, yet there is no particular line which is always found in the most completely beautiful.[56]

---

[53] *Inquiry* 4.16; 1761, pp. 279-280; *Works* 1.191. The addition constitutes sentences 5-7 of the section.

[54] Forster, *Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. 1871, 1.107.

[55] *Literary Magazine* 2.187.

[56] *Inquiry* 3.15; 1761, pp. 216-217; *Works* 1.163. The addition comprises the last six sentences of the section.

This addition suggests either that Burke, though he finished his work in 1753, did not come upon Hogarth's book, which was published in December, 1753,[57] until his own first edition had appeared; or else that he made no changes in the writing during the four years in which it lay by him; the latter supposition is strenghthened by Burke's own statement in his first Preface:

> It is four years now since this inquiry was finished, during which time the author found no cause to make any material alteration in his theory.[58]

It is unlikely that Burke, in his extended refutation[59] of the arguments for proportion and fitness as causes of beauty, was glancing at Hogarth, as Bosanquet[60] asserts. There is little in Hogarth's confused work that could be taken for the set of ideas Burke was opposing. It is true that in one passage[61] Burke seems to notice a view held by Hogarth[62] that our judgment of beauty depends upon an intuitive perception of the fitness of the observed proportion for use; but much of Burke's attack on proportion and fitness is found in the first edition, and at the time of writing this, Burke, as we see, probably did not know the *Analysis*. The principal advocates of proportion and fitness were writers who had been longer known and better received than Hogarth. Shaftesbury and Hutcheson had developed the idea of a "sense of beauty" that responds to perceived proportions. Shaftesbury and Bishop Berkeley had, with varying emphasis, united proportion, fitness, and beauty.[63]

The passage on fitness, inserted in the second edition, has already been accounted for in the discussion of Goldsmith's influence on Burke. The additions on proportion can be attributed in part to Murphy's curt insistence[64] that "a beautiful and entire whole never existed without proportion," and chiefly to the longer argument in the *Critical Review*,[65] which laid great stress on a general range of proportions in each type of beauty, and asserted that "proportion is symmetry." The vague ideas of proportion held by his critics led Burke to insert two pages[66] on its definition and his method of reasoning about it. Proportion he defined to be the measure of relative quantity. He demanded of his opponents demonstrative proof that in every type of beautiful object there is a fixed quantitative relation of parts. He himself in subsequent passages undertook to show the absence of such a relation. With one exception, these passages are not new; the single change is the argument from the different proportions of the sexes in the same species.[67] It is of interest that Burke's refusal to reduce beauty to definite ratios won Ruskin's cordial assent in *Modern Painters*.[68]

---

[57] *Dictionary of National Biography* 27.89.

[58] *Inquiry*, 1757, p. vii.

[59] *Inquiry* 3.1-8.

[60] *History of Aesthetic*, 1917, p. 208.

[61] *Inquiry* 3.6; 1761, p. 191 ff.; *Works* 1.151 ff.

[62] *Analysis of Beauty*, ch. 11.

[63] Shaftesbury, *Miscellaneous Reflections* 3.2; *Moralists* 2.4. Hutcheson, *Inquiry concerning Beauty, Order, Harmony, and Design* 1.12; 2.7, 8, 10, 11. Berkeley, *Alciphron* 3.8, 9.

[64] *Literary Magazine* 2.187.

The declaration in the *Critical Review*,[69] that "the well-proportioned parts of the human body are constantly found beautiful," Burke met with the challenge:

> You may assign any proportions you please to every part of the human body, and I undertake that a painter shall religiously observe them all, and notwithstanding produce, if he please, a very ugly figure.[70]

Burke now turned to the broader meaning, suggested in the words already quoted from the *Critical Review*, of proportion as a common form of a species within which individuals vary considerably.[71] The confusion of beauty and proportion taken as the common form he found to be due to this, that beauty was commonly opposed to deformity. Burke rightly held that the opposite of beauty is ugliness, not deformity, and he strengthened his case[72] against the common or customary form by repeating the argument of the first section of the *Inquiry*. In this he had held that novelty is necessary to beauty, and that custom soon stales all beauty.

---

[65] *Critical Review* 3.366–367.

[66] *Inquiry* 3.2; 1761, pp. 164-168; *Works* 1.139-141. The addition begins 'what proportion is' and ends 'whilst we inquire in the first place.'

[67] *Inquiry* 3.4; 1761, pp. 177-179; *Works* 1.145-146. The addition so far as here in point begins 'Let us rest a moment on this point' and covers six sentences.

[68] *Modern Painters* 3.1.6; ed. by Cook and Wedderburn, 4.109.

[69] *Critical Review* 3.367.

[70] *Inquiry* 3.4; 1761, p. 176; *Works* 1.144–145. The addition is one of three sentences, beginning 'You may asign any proportions.'

[71] *Inquiry* 3.4; 1761, pp. 179-186; *Works* 1.146-149. The addition here in question is the rest of the section after the matter mentioned in note 67.

a thing of beauty is a joy for-ever?

Except for the long section on Power, the new matter on proportion and fitness constitutes the most considerable of the additions to the *Inquiry* proper.

The *Critical Review* joined Goldsmith in the attack on Burke's central position, that the sublime is caused by a mode of pain, as some tension or labor of the physical organism, or by ideas associated with pain, and that pleasure is caused by a relaxation of the nerves or by related ideas. Goldsmith's citation of a mixed instance has been mentioned. The *Critical Review*[73] suggested that the pleasures of love might be considered "an exertion of the nerves to a tension that borders upon pain." Since this would be an instance, if admitted, of positive pleasure derived from a relation to pain, it would break down the fundamental distinction. Burke, therefore, struck out of his definition of love, "desire or lust, which is an energy of the mind, that hurries us on to the possession of certain objects, that do not affect us as they are beautiful, but by means altogether different."[74] But this arbitrary exclusion did not satisfy him; in the section on the physical cause of love, accordingly, he added both an appeal to the general experience of mankind, and an admission that partial exceptions might occur:

> Who is a stranger to that manner of expression so common in all times and in all countries, of being softened, relaxed, enervated, dissolved, melted away by pleasure? The universal voice of mankind, faithful to their feelings, concurs in affirming this uniform and general effect; and although some odd and particular instance may perhaps be found, wherein there appears a considerable degree of positive pleasure, without all the characters of relaxation, we must not therefore reject the conclusion we had drawn from a concurrence of many experiments; but we must still retain it, subjoining the exceptions which may occur according to the judicious rule laid down by Sir Isaac Newton in the third book of his *Optics*.[75]

---

[72] *Inquiry* 3.5; 1761, pp. 187-188, 189-190; *Works* 1.150, 150-151. Three sentences beginning 'Indeed beauty is so far'; and five sentences beginning 'Indeed, so far are use and habit.'

[73] *Critical Review* 3.369.

[74] *Inquiry* 3.1; 1761, p. 162; *Works* 1.138.

[75] *Inquiry* 4.19; 1761, p. 288; *Works* 1.195.

To Part IV, which, it will be remembered, deals with the efficient or physical causes of the sublime and the beautiful, two other small additions were evoked by the *Critical Review.*

> We likewise conceive he is mistaken in his theory, when he affirms that the rays falling on the eye, if they frequently vary their nature, now to blue, now to red, and so on . . . produce a sort of relaxation or rest to the organ, which prevents that tension or labor allied to pain, the cause of the sublime. Such a quick and abrupt succession of contrasted colors and shapes, will demand a quick succession of changes in the . . . eye, which, instead of relaxing and refreshing, harass the organ into the most painful exertions.[76]

Burke replied[77] by contrasting "the different effects of some strong exercise and some little piddling action." The reviewer's second objection was to Burke's classifying sweet things with those that are smooth and relaxing; he held instead "that sweet things act by stimulation, upon the taste as well as upon the smell."[78] The author's rejoinder was an appeal to the custom of languages: in Latin, French, and Italian, "soft and sweet have but one name."[79]

The effect of Murphy's criticisms, in so far as they did not coincide with those of the other two reviewers, is easily traced. His speculation,[80] that "astonishment is perhaps that state of the soul, when the powers of the mind are suspended with wonder," rather than with horror, drove Burke to defend his own theory by instancing the use of several languages.[81] Murphy's argument [82] against Burke's idea that words affect the emotions without raising images in the mind, led to two long additions, the first of which shows Burke at his best, illustrating his argument by apt quotation and comment. The reviewer's argument had been:

> On hearing any of these words [virtue, honor, cited by Burke], a man may not instantly have in view all the ideas that are combined in the complex one

---

[76] *Critical Review* 3.369.

[77] *Inquiry* 4.10; 1761, pp. 262-263; *Works* 1.183. The addition is the third sentence of the section.

[78] *Critical Review* 3.370.

[79] *Inquiry* 4.22; 1761, p. 296; *Works* 1.199. The addition in this section comprises sentences 3-5.

[80] *Literary Magazine* 2.185.

[81] *Inquiry* 2.2; 1761, pp. 97-98; *Works* 1.109. The addition comprises the last seven sentences of the section.

[82] *Literary Magazine* 2.188.

> . . . but he may have the general idea . . . and that is enough for the poet's purpose.

Burke's reply began:

> Indeed, so little does poetry depend for its effect on the power of raising sensible images, that I am convinced it would lose a very considerable part of its energy if this were the necessary result of a description. Because that union of affecting words, which is the most powerful of all poetical instruments, would frequently lose its force along with its propriety and consistency, if the sensible images were always excited.[83]

Citations from Virgil, Homer, and Lucretius are brought to illustrate the confusion of images by which poets affect the passions. The second addition in this part is a passage distinguishing a clear from a strong expression. It is directed against a statement of Murphy's:

> He who is most picturesque and clearest in his imagery, is ever styled the best poet, because from such a one we see things clearer, and of course we feel more intensely. It is a disposition to feel the force of words, and to combine the ideas annexed to them with quickness, that shows one man's imagination to be better than another's.

The distinction between clearness and force which Burke made here, he had already stated quite definitely in a different context and even in the first edition.[84]

> But still it will be difficult to conceive how words can move the passions which belong to real objects without representing these objects clearly. This is difficult to us, because we do not sufficiently distinguish, in our observations upon language, between a clear expression and a strong expression. These are frequently confounded with each other, though they are in reality extremely different. The former regards the understanding, the latter belongs to the passions. The one describes a thing as it is, the latter describes it as it is felt.[85]

Here we may conclude the account of Burke's alterations so far as they were inspired by objections to his thought. A word may be said of Burke's use of Biblical quotations in illustration or enforcement of his ideas. Except for a brief reference to the phrase "the angel of the Lord,"[86] all the passages from the

---

[83] *Inquiry* 5.5; 1761, pp. 328-332; *Works* 1.213-215. The addition begins with the sentences quoted and runs to the end of the section.

[84] *Inquiry* 2.4, *Of the difference between Clearness and Obscurity with regard to the Passions*.

[85] *Inquiry* 5.7; 1761, pp. 338-341; *Works* 1.218-219. The addition runs from 'if they may properly be called ideas' to the end of the paragraph.

[86] *Inquiry* 5.7; 1761, p. 336; *Works* 1.217.

Bible appear for the first time in the enlarged edition. All are adduced as examples of the sublime. With two exceptions, all appear in the section on Power.[87] One passage is drawn from Ecclesiasticus; all the others come either from Job or from the Psalms. It is probable that two papers by Joseph Warton in the *Adventurer*[88] inspired these additions. Warton's essays are in the form of a newly-discovered letter from Longinus in praise of the Hebrew writings, and include, among others, passages from the Psalms and from Job, though none of those used by Burke.

The collation of the two editions has then shown that no changes in structure or substance were made by Burke; that in point of style he was sensitive to the turn of a sentence, and quite willing to alter details of expression; and that he was so keenly sensitive to the public reception of his work as to regard almost every objection raised against him as a challenge to defend his position.

HERBERT A. WICHELNS

New York University

---

[87] The exceptions are the vision of Job, *Inquiry* 2.[4], last paragraph, and the panegyric of Simon from Ecclesiasticus, *Inquiry* 2.13.

[88] *Adventurer* Nos. 51, 57. The statement as to Warton's authorship is found in a note to the final essay of the series.

METHODS OF SATIRE IN THE POLITICAL DRAMA OF THE RESTORATION

Political satire in the Restoration drama can largely be classified under four headings, with reference to the method employed in inserting it in the plays. First, there is the parallel play, with its basis of real or feigned history, such as Dryden's *The Duke of Guise* and several of Crowne's and Southerne's plays. The purpose of this kind of play is to cast ridicule upon a party or faction by a display of the folly of their views in the action of the play. In this sense *Coriolanus* is a satire upon popular government. Such a play may be purely didactic. *Gorboduc*, for example, may be interpreted as a serious exposition of the misery arising from civil discord. The action may be subordinated to the introduction of caricatures of political opponents, as is the case with Crowne's *City Politics*. The parallel play may be comedy or tragedy. Rowe's *Tamerlane* is a tragedy, but it satirizes Louis XIV, in the person of Bajazet, by making him utterly ridiculous, and by contrasting him with the high-minded Tamerlane, William III.

Second, political satire in the drama often makes use of the typical character. The use of the typical character is a part of the classical theory of comedy, and, as such, was a part of the dramatic theory of Ben Jonson, who had great influence upon the political satire of the Restoration period.

From the typical character it is an easy step to the use of persons in the drama. Ben Jonson may not have introduced contemporary Puritan individuals into his comedies, but some of the Restoration dramatists had no hesitation about doing so. Besides, partisan warfare such as that which existed about 1680 is not likely to be free from personalities.

The fourth method employed consisted in the insertion of satirical remarks about political conditions or problems into the plays. Such remarks were often put into the mouths of unimportant characters, as was the case in *Eastward Hoe*, where the remarks that apparently gave most offense and landed the authors, Jonson, Chapman, and Marston, in jail, are spoken by an unimportant sea captain.

All four of these methods may exist in combination, or only one may be used in a given play. Dryden's *Albion and Albanius* and possibly *The Duke of Guise* employ all four of the methods in a single play. The comedy of manners, on the other hand, ordinarily contented itself with sneering comments about the Puritans.

The most important of the four methods is the parallel play, which appeared in great numbers. It was the favorite method of Dryden, Crowne, and Southerne, not to mention many inferior dramatists. This may be ascribed to two things: the taste for allegory, and the comparative safety of the method for the dramatist. The age of Dryden, it should be remembered, is the age of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, the readers of which were, to be sure, of a very different class from that which frequented the theaters, and it precedes the age of *A Tale of a Tub* and *Gulliver's Travels*. It is also the age of *Absalom and Achitophel* and *The Hind and the Panther*. It is not least among the times that loved allegory.

If the play is to be personal, the allegorical nature of the parallel play offers a very convenient refuge. The playwright may avow, as Dryden did in the case of *The Duke of Guise*, that the "play's a parallel" or he may deny that it has any significance whatever, as Southerne did in the case of *The Spartan Dame*, written about the time of the Revolution of 1688. The plot of Southerne's play is based upon the story of the expulsion of Leonidas by Cleombrotus, his son-in-law. This play was begun, it is needless to say, before William had succeeded to the throne formerly held by his father-in-law.

If the parallel play permitted the dramatist to equivocate about his intentions, it sometimes got him into trouble when no offense was intended. Dryden's *Cleomenes* may not be a parallel play at all, but it gave offense to Queen Mary, though her anger was apparently against certain passages and not against the nature of the plot. Tate's adaptation of *Richard II* met with as much disfavor from the court party as *Richard II* itself did from Elizabeth, when it was being used as a parallel play by Essex. Nor were Tate and Dryden the only sufferers. Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus*, in which the character in the title rôle represents, in some measure, Charles II, was stopped on the third night as anti-monarchical, though the play is about as anti-monarchical as Corneille's *Cinna*. The play does contain some ridicule of kings, but it is spoken by Vindicius, a demagogue, who is evidently patterned after the tribunes of the people in *Coriolanus*.

The parallel play might be concerned only with presenting a principle or an institution, as was the case with Settle's *The Female Prelate*, in which the satire was directed against the Roman Catholic Church as an institution, the inference to be drawn from the play being that what was once true of the church was still true, even though the methods of the church might have changed. Or the satire in the parallel play might be largely directed against individuals, as was the case with Crowne's *City Politics*, in which the Neapolitan setting and the Italian names form an almost transparent disguise for Shaftesbury, Oates, and others, or in Southerne's *Loyal Brother*, the action of which takes place in Persia, but the villain which is Shaftesbury.

All such political plays are allegorical in their nature, as was the prophet Nathan's story of the ewe lamb. In fact, the quintessence of the satire of the early eighties may be found in Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*. But such plays seldom passed into such undiluted allegory as Dryden's *Albion and Albanius*, in which we take leave of the machinery of history and romance, and adopt that of the mask or opera.

Ward says, in his *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, that, in the time of the Restoration, "No voice—except that of Milton prophesying in his days of darkness—was heard to protest against this servility of sentiment—to the Crown."[1] We need to know more about the real meanings of the parallel plays to be able to accept this statement. True, most of the dramatists favored the Crown, but Pepys considered Robert Howard's *The Duke of Lerma* a satire upon one of the prerogatives of Charles II.[2] He also records the furious anger of the king over Edward Howard's *The Change of Crowns*,[3] the exact nature of which play we do not know, though it seems to have had elements of the parallel play.

---

[1] Second Edition, Vol. III, p. 293.

[2] Pepys's *Diary*, February 20, 1667-8.

[3] *Ibid.*, April 15 and 16, 1667.

The genesis of the parallel play may be sought in the French romances, with their use of allegory, or in the plays of Pierre Corneille, the political nature of which was perfectly known to Dryden, who says in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, "Look upon the *Cinna* and the *Pompey;* they are not so properly to be called plays as long discourses of reason of state." It is not necessary, however, so far as the dramatists of the Restoration are concerned, to seek for French origins. The parallel political play had already existed in England before the Civil War. John Tatham does not figure largely in the standard histories of English dramatic literature. Ward gives him three lines in footnotes with mention of his name in the text and Professor Schelling devotes about fifteen lines to him in *The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Nevertheless, he is important as a connecting link between the two divisions of the Stuart drama, and he illustrates more clearly than any other author of the period the methods and material of the dramatic satire of the Restoration.

In 1641 Tatham wrote *The Distracted State.* In this play Sicily of the time of Agathocles is put on exhibition to show that the professions of popular leaders are not to be trusted and that the whole nation suffers from any attempt to dethrone an established and legitimate royal family. The play is apparently not personal. The Scotch are satirized; so are all those who were not loyal to Charles I. Here was a parallel play before the Civil War, that employed the methods of *The Duke of Guise*, and, incidentally, some of the same arguments. And this play is not unique.

No one would, I suppose, seriously question the native English origin of typical, or "humour," satire, as applied to Puritans. The work of Ben Jonson, the creator of Tribulation Wholesome and Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, in this field is too well known to need comment. The relation of satire against the Puritans to political satire comes from the fact that the Puritan was politics: he was the chief problem with which the Crown had to deal from the beginning of the reign of James I onward. Ben Jonson recognized that fact, though he considered that the root of the perversity of the Puritan was in human nature itself. Probee, one of the characters in the Induction to *The Magnetic Lady*, says: "The reconciliation of humours is a bold undertaking, far greater than the reconciliation of both churches, the quarrel between humours being ancienter, and in my opinion, the root of all faction and schism in church and commonwealth."

From the time of Ben Jonson the Puritan was a stock figure in comedy. The tradition is continuous through Cartwright and other sons of Ben, Tatham, and Wilson to Shadwell. Moreover, when the Puritan appeared in the comedy of manners, which was but seldom, for the writers of the comedy of manners regarded the Puritan as "low," he showed Jonsonian traits. Traces of the manner of Ben Jonson may be found in Sir Nicholas Cully, a Puritan character of Etheredge's first play, *The Comical Revenge*, and in Sir Samuel Forecast, of Sedley's *Mulberry Garden*. Mrs. Saintly, of Dryden's *Limberham*, is assuredly of the Jonsonian type. As late as 1709, almost exactly a hundred years after the appearance of *The Alchemist* with its Ananias and Tribulation Wholesome, Thomas D'Urfey produced the *Modern Prophets*, a play satirized in the *Tatler* (Nos. 1,4,11,43), in which D'Urfey ridiculed the Puritans .in the good old Jonsonian way.

Since the Puritans detested plays, play actors, and playhouses at all times, it is easy to see that there was little love lost between them and the Royalist supporters of the theater. There are, however, three distinct degrees in the treatment of the Puritans as a comic figure. The Jonsonian figure, a canting hypocrite, decrying the things of the world and secretly enjoying them, a "humour" character, prevailed before 1642. Immediately after the Restoration, he reappeared as an even more maleficent figure, one given to casuistry, as Scruple, in Wilson's *The Cheats*, a minister who will "conform, reform, transform, perform, deform, inform, any form" for three hundred pounds a year, or to abuse of power, as Mr. Day, in *The Committee*. The playwrights had just endured a long period of Puritan rule and felt toward the Puritans about as a Russian *émigré* does toward Communists. In addition to these changes, the personal element figured to a great degree. Cromwell and his associates appeared in the drama in person, there to be held up to the execrations of an angry, exultant mob.

In the third period, the treatment of the Puritans is much more conventional. In the hands of Shadwell it returns to the

Jonsonian tradition. The Puritan was, for the most part, to be found in the ranks of the Whigs, after the parties took shape about 1680, but it is incorrect to think that the satire of that period against the Puritans is as malicious as that of the earliest period. Satire of the Puritans had some value to the Tory party, but, when it was employed, it was largely a matter of convention or imitation or downright plagiarism from older writers. The Tory dramatists were interested in Puritans just so far as Puritans were Whigs or just so far as they could cast contempt upon the Whigs by associating them with the frightful days of Cromwell. Professor Schelling, in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*[4] mentions two Tory satires of the eighties that illustrate the continued use of the Puritan as an object of satire: Crowne's *City Politics,*[5] and Mrs. Behn's *The Roundheads.* The former is, however, only to a slight degree a satire upon the Puritans as Puritans; it is a personal assault upon Shaftesbury and his following. Such satire of the Puritans as exists is conventional, harking back to the sixties. Mrs. Behn's *The Roundheads* is her version of Tatham's *The Rump*. What she did was to eliminate the slight love affair of the original and substitute a large amount of intrigue, in which she was a specialist, invent conventional "humour" characters, such as Ananias Goggle, a Jonsonian Puritan, and treat Lady Cromwell more respectfully than the original did. The rest of the satire is, of course, Tatham's.

Although the Puritans were, for the most part, Whigs, satire of the Puritans was a distinct thing from satire of the Whigs. This is proved by the writings of Shadwell, who never ceased to satirize the Puritans. In his last play, *The Volunteers* (1693), he mingles ridicule of the Jacobites with ridicule of the Puritans in the person of an Anabaptist, Hackwell, who had served under Oliver. This character, as well as Scrape-All, of *The Squire of Alsatia* (1688), was created by the man who had enraged the Tories, high and low, by his caricature of the High Churchman in the person of Smerk, the hypocritical chaplain of *The Lancashire Witches*.

---

[4] Vol. VIII, p. 122.

[5] The date of *City Politics* is 1683, not 1673, as it is printed on p. 122. See p. 188 of the same volume.

Ward says that the Restoration dramatists, "in their personal abuse of the enemies, real or supposed, of the cause with which they have identified themselves, add a new element . . . to the literature of the theater."[6] The word *new* is undoubtedly too strong. Personal abuse on the stage is, of course, as old as Aristophanes. The War of the Theaters showed that the great Elizabethans were not wholly averse to personal satire. Shirley is said by Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, to have satirized persons about the court in his and Chapman's forbidden play, *The Ball* (1632). It is true that the amount of personal satire increased after the Restoration, and that it formed the chief feature of the early Tory satires of Crowne and Southerne.

Again, John Tatham is interesting as one who led the way. His *The Rump; or a Mirrour of the Late Times* (1660) is largely personal. The play is a caricature of the events in London between the death of Cromwell and the arrival of Monk. The characters are presented with only the thinnest of disguises, that is, disguise produced by a slight change of name. Lambert appears as Bertlam; Wareston, as Stoneware, and so on. The characters are treated with the greatest malevolence. Fleetwood is a canting hypocrite; Wareston is given to low trickery and ribaldry. The women fare no better than the men. Lady Lambert is domineering, revengeful, and, of course, unfaithful to her husband. Lady Cromwell is a coarse old vixen, who attempts to scratch Lady Lambert's face in return for a sneering remark. She raves over her troubles and predicts for herself a life as an oyster woman or bawd. The play is interesting not only as marking the high- or low-water mark of the personal in the Restoration drama, but is a joy to the source hunter, who can find therein not only reflections of Ben Jonson but imitations of Rabelais and Aristophanes, the father of the personal attack by means of comedy. The virulence and malignity of its portrait painting were not surpassed during the Age of the Restoration, though it fell to more skilled hands, such as Otway, Crowne, and Dryden, to depict Shaftesbury.

Only a word need be said about the practice of satirizing persons or principles in the dialogue itself. Ben Jonson had used no little amount of this kind of satire. His jail experience did not cure him of the habit. His contemporaries and successors, such as Shirley, Brome, Davenant, Mayne, and Killegrew continued his manner of poking fun at the Puritans in this way.

---

[6] *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, Second Edition, Vol. III, p. 293.

Such satire served one useful purpose in the Restoration drama. As has already been said, the writers of the comedy of manners would not, as a rule, use Puritan characters, because they were "low." Their "high bred" characters could, however, ridicule the Puritans. This is the principal political satire that appears in the comedy of manners. Dryden made extensive use of this method. In his first comedy, *The Wild Gallant*, there is a character who is an ex-Puritan, but little use is made of him as a "humour" character. The real satire comes from the allusions by other characters to the Rump Act and the "gude Scotch Kivenant."

As in the case of the heroic drama of the Restoration, which can be traced back, so far as its principal elements are concerned, to Fletcher and Marlowe, by way of D'Avenant, so the methods of the dramatic satirists of the Restoration go back to Ben Jonson and his contemporaries, by way of John Tatham, who resembles D'Avenant in connecting the old and the new. Satire of the Puritans was as old as Ben Jonson and Shakespeare, but it became bitter and personal just after the close of the Civil War, while the Puritan figures were looming so large in retrospect. It was only the ghosts of these figures, combined with the stock characters from the Jonsonian tradition, that were evoked during the stormy period of Shaftesbury's attempted domination of state affairs. This satire of the Puritans was undoubtedly used with a political purpose, but it must be distinguished from party satire. There was, on the whole, little that was new about the methods of the Restoration political drama, even if no other period has produced so much drama that "foamed with politics."

VIRGIL L. JONES

University of Arkansas

A NOTE ON KLEIST'S *PRINZ VON HOMBURG*

In Kleist's *Prinz von Homburg* the hero, an impetuous young cavalry officer, is charged with disobedience to military orders. Though a prince, he is court-martialed for this breach of discipline and, despite the further fact that the military action in question was crowned by victory, he is pronounced guilty as charged and sentenced to death. The self-centered nature and defiantly individualistic attitude of the young man now, in the hours of deepest humiliation, undergo a profound change; his former irresponsible haughtiness gives way to a broader, social view of disciplined patriotism. It is the chastening experience within prison walls which effects his spiritual regeneration, and the absolute change thus wrought in his soul is dramatically revealed when the elector's letter suddenly throws upon him the tremendous moral responsibility of judging his own case. Under this unexpected appeal to his innermost being the young officer superbly rises to the full stature of his manliness. Sincerely and profoundly regretting his personal insubordination and eager to atone for his gravely irresponsible conduct, he fervently desires that he be sacrificed to the larger principle of eternal law and order as he now sees it. Only in view of this complete transformation does the elector then order, not only the revocation of the death sentence, but also the pardon of the prince.

The relation between Kleist's much discussed motif and a strikingly similar episode in Livy (VIII, 30-35) has been dealt with in detail by Johannes Niejahr.[1] Professor Nollen, in his scholarly edition of the *Prinz von Homburg*, epitomizes Livy's account in the following passage: "In the second Samnite war the master of the horse, Q. Fabius, 'a high-spirited youth,' contrary to the explicit orders of the dictator, L. Papirius, attacked the enemy at a favorable moment, and with a desperate cavalry charge put them to flight. Papirius, enraged at such a flagrant breach of discipline, and still more at the young man's persistence in subborn defiance of his authority, summarily condemned him to death, and turned a deaf ear to the entreaties of the whole army, and even of the senate, when they pleaded for mercy. Only when Fabius himself fell at the dictator's feet with a humble confession of his guilt, when 'military discipline and the majesty of government had prevailed' and the defiant pride of the young officer had been broken, did Papirius grant the life of Fabius 'as a boon to the Roman people,' amid universal applause."

---

[1] Cf. his article *Ein Livianisches Motiv in Kleist's Prinz von Homburg* in Euphorion IV, 61.

I have ventured to recall these two parallel episodes for the reason that they were brought back vividly to my mind by the following brief historical account of the stern working of military law in Thomas Fuller's *The Holy State and the Prophane State*, the first edition of which appeared in 1642. In the passage in question, Fuller relates the interesting and touching fate of "the French soldier in Scotland, some eighty years since,[2] who first mounted the bulwark of a fort besieged, whereupon ensued the gaining of the fort: but Marescal de Thermes, the French general, first knighted him and then hanged him within an hour after, because he had done without commandment." I do not recall having seen any reference to this incident in connection with Kleist's play; to forestall a possible misapprehension, however, I ought to add that I am taking this occasion to draw attention to it solely because of the features which are common both to Kleist's motif and the historical episode. Whether there is reason to suspect any influence, direct or indirect, in the matter, I am not prepared to say; in view of the very much closer Livian account, however, I confess I am inclined to doubt it.

I feel moved to point out, in an English work of fiction, another scene whereof certain features naturally provoke a comparison with at least one phase of the painful experience of Kleist's hero. I have in mind the scene in Scott's *The Fair Maid of Perth* in which the young Highland chief, Conachar, at the mere thought of an impending battle, betrays an abject cowardice—a situation reminding one of the unconventional scene in Kleist's drama where we see the young officer, the undaunted hero of more than one battle, so completely unmanned by the harrowing sight of his own grave as to be reduced to a state of groveling helplessness—an ordeal which he undergoes while still a prisoner and prior to his regeneration. Since the *Fair Maid of Perth* is one of Scott's least popular novels, it may be desirable to present the arresting episode somewhat fully.

---

[2] This would fix the date of the incident at about 1560, at which time there were French soldiers in Scotland. I found no mention of the particular episode in the historical works which were accessible to me.

In a scene well-nigh as bold as Kleist's, Scott introduces the reader to old Simon Glover's hut. "Two hours before the black-cock crew," we read, "Simon Glover was awakened by a well-known voice, which called him by name." When he raised his eyes he saw standing before him not "the mail-clad Highland chief, with claymore [a heavy two-handed broadsword] in hand, as he had seen him the preceding night, but Conachar of Curfew Street, in his humble apprentice's garb, holding in his hand a switch of oak" and carrying "a piece of lighted bog-wood . . . in a lantern."

The young chief who comes at this unusual hour to press old Simon to bestow upon him his daughter Catharine, finally, despite his ardent suit, receives the unequivocal and disheartening answer, "With my consent my daughter shall never wed save in her own degree," whereupon he exclaims in despair, "Farewell the only hope which would have lighted me to fame or victory." And shortly after he adds, "I am about to tell you a secret . . . the deepest and dearest secret that man ever confided to man." This he does not reveal at once, however. Instead, by way of preparing the way for his intimate disclosure, he asks, "In this age of battle, father, you have yourself been a combatant?" A brief question indeed, but quite sufficient to induce old Simon to relate at some length the war-like experience of his earlier years. In the course of his narrative he frankly confesses that he seldom slept worse than the night before the expected onslaught which he describes. In the morning the warriors were summoned to their places by the ringing of a bell. Of the tolling of that bell he says, "I never heard its sound peal so like a passing knell before or since." Nevertheless the "cold fit" and the "strange breathlessness" which he experienced, together with a "desire to go home for a glass of distilled waters" when he saw the enemy "marching forward to the attack in strong columns," soon gave way to composure and self-control, and during the actual conflict, as he declares, his conduct even "gained some credit."

At this point of the old man's recital the imagination of the young Highland chief, stirred to feverish excitement, conjures up the horrors of an impending fray between two powerful clans which is to settle a mountain-feud of long standing—a conflict in which he will be compelled to participate. And under the spell of his vivid mental picture he suddenly utters the startling confession, "Father, I am a Coward!" Then launching forth upon a description of the "demoniac fury" of the bloody fray as he conceives it, he speaks as follows, "Blows clang, and blood flows, thicker, faster, redder; they rush on each other like madmen, they tear each other like wild beasts; the wounded trodden to death amid the feet of their companions! Blood ebbs, arms become weak; but there must be no parley, no truce, no interruption, while any of the maimed wretches remain alive! Here is no crouching behind battlements, no fighting with missile weapons: all is hand to hand, till hands can no longer be raised to maintain the ghastly conflict! If such a field is so horrible in idea, what think you it will be in reality?" How vividly all this reminds one of the piteous outburst of Kleist's unnerved hero after he has caught a glimpse of his own open grave. Constitutionally weak of nerve, the young Scotch chief feels that with one blow all support has been knocked out from under him, for in his ardent suit for Simon Glover's daughter he has failed; we now see him in a state of moral helplessness well-nigh as abject as that of the young imprisoned officer under sentence of death in the *Prinz von Homburg*.

Scott did not intend in his novel, any more than did Kleist in his drama, that his young hero should by his betrayal of fear forfeit our sympathy; nor, indeed, does he, and least of all when he exclaims, "Were Catharine to look kindly on the earnest love I bear her, it would carry me against the front of the enemies with the mettle of a war-horse. Overwhelming as my sense of weakness is, the feeling that Catharine looked on would give me strength. Say yet—oh, say yet—she shall be mine if we gain the combat, and not the Gow Chrom himself, whose heart is of a piece with his anvil, ever went to battle so light as I shall do! One strong passion is conquered by another."[3]

---

[3] In Kleist's play it is the hero who finally, in the hour of supreme trial,

Though the characters about which Scott wove his novel are admittedly fictitious, we know from his own statement that in his story he utilized features of an episode which he found ready to hand in a historical record dealing with a "barrier-battle" and chronicling even "the flight of one of the appointed champions." Perhaps there is no reason, therefore, to suspect any further literary influence here, even in the way of suggestion, despite the fact that both in Kleist's play (published in 1821) and in Scott's novel (1828) the particular feature under consideration is virtually the same, namely, an exhibition of cowardice in an author's male character, and despite the further fact that Scott not only admired German literature but even prepared and published some translations from German authors. Still, in any case, we have before us two interesting examples of an unusual theme in literature which, for purposes of comparison, it seemed desirable to bring together within the same field of vision.

C. H. Ibershoff

University of Iowa

---

sustains the woman, and not vice versa—a situation quite in keeping with the poet's characteristic conception of the ideal woman.

DR. GROSART'S ROSALIND

Dr. Grosart's well known interpretation of the Rosalind *loci* in the *Shepheardes Calender* is definitely based on his whole conception of early Spenserian biography. He declared that Spenser's family originated in northeastern Lancashire, and based this opinion on Spenser's spelling of his name and on his apparent use of Lancashire scenery and Lancashire dialect, especially in the *Shepheardes Calender*.[1] Arguing from this premise, he maintained that Spenser, at the end of his University career, visited his relatives in Lancashire, there fell in love with Rosalind, and wrote the *Calender*,[2] and finally, as a corollary to all this, he declared himself "satisfied" that Rosalind was some as yet "untraced Rose or Eliza or Alice Dineley or Dynley or Dinlei" of north-eastern Lancashire.[3]

This theory, originally promulgated in 1882–4, has been much attacked of recent years. In 1897, Herford found the diction and grammar of the *Calender* "highly composite,"[4] but drew no conclusions as to the tenability of Grosart's opinions: indeed, he appears to have accepted them. In 1908, Long pointed out that Elizabethan spelling of proper names was not fixed, that the scenery in the *Calender* is not especially Lancastrian, and that the words beginning with A and B in Grosart's list were not peculiar to Lancashire—if we may use modern dialects as a criterion for Elizabethan: in fact, Spenser could have found most of the words in Chaucer or in the English and Scotch Chaucerians.[5] Long's work has shaken the confidence of many scholars in Grosart's theory.[6] In 1919, the present author reviewed the entire list of words glossed by E. K., and came to the conclusion that a dialectical provenience need be sought for only a very few and that those few were localized mainly in Yorkshire rather than Lancashire.[7] Tests of vocabulary and of inflectional forms, have, therefore, seriously undermined Grosart's point of view, but, since it is still widely propagated by standard works and occasionally by a current volume,[8] any further evidence may still be timely.

---

[1] Spenser, *Works*, ed. Grosart, I, xlii *et seq.*

[2] *Ibid.* I, 43 *et seq.* The recent discovery that Spenser was Secretary to the Bishop of Rochester in 1578 certainly does not bear out this conjecture, *Pro. Brit. Acad.* 1907-8, 103.

[3] *Ibid.* I, 50 *et seq.*

[4] Spenser, *Shep Cal.*, London, 1914, xiv, lvii, *etc.* Even this edition shows no change from Herford's original acceptance of Grosart.

[5] *Anglia* XXXI, 72 *et seq.*

[6] Higginson in his *Spenser's Shepherd's Calender*, New York, 1912, 289 *et seq.*, especially emphasizes the significance of Long's work. Higginson reviews scholarly opinion at length.

Although the *Calender* has been studied for diction and grammatical forms, questions of phonology, especially as expressed in the rhymes, have been largely neglected; and, indeed, Herford remarks that the phonetic characteristics of the Lancashire dialect of Elizabeth's day are "chiefly a matter of inference."[9] Since the publication of his book, however, further light has been shed on the matter: in 1920, Brown edited the *Stonyhurst Pageants*,[10] a body of verse running to almost nine thousand lines, which, as he shows in his *Introduction*, was composed in Lancashire shortly after 1610. This is a far safer test of Grosart's dialect theory than the evidence of verbal peculiarities of which we have record only in the late Nineteenth Century; and, although pronunciation may have changed in Lancashire between the 1570's and the early Seventeenth Century, the change was probably small, for dialects are conservative and Lancashire was remote from foreign influence.

The significant fact is that the *Pageants* show a peculiarity not usually to be found in Elizabethan literature: the rhyming of *ee* as in *seen* with *i* as in *sign*. Thus, as Brown points out in his *Introduction*, "*bee*, *hee*, *mee*, *see*, *thee*, and *tree* are made to rhyme with *by*, *cry*, *dry*, *eye*, *flye*, *I*, *lye*, *nigh*, *thigh*, *try*, *tye*, and *why*."[11] The natural inference is that these words must have been pronounced nearly, if not exactly, alike. The association, moreover, of this peculiarity with the northern dialects—if not especially with Lancashire—is borne out by its appearance north of the Tweed: turning over some forty pages of Drummond's *Works*,[12] one finds six cases of it. In short, if one may hazard a theory in so difficult a field as Elizabethan phonology, it would appear that in the North, and particularly in Lancashire, ME *ē* shifted its sound, before or during Elizabethan times, to the modern pronunciation, expressed in *maître phonétique* as *i* —without any corresponding shift of ME *ī* to the modern diphthong *ai*. At all events, it is reasonably certain that *ī* and *ē* (spelled *ee*) were pronounced alike.

---

[7] *Jour. Eng. Ger. Phil.* XVIII, 556 *et seq.*

[8] *Vide* Higginson, *op. cit.*, 290, note 13. One might add other names to this list.

[9] Herford, *op. cit.* liii.

[10] Carleton Brown, *The Stonyhurst Pageants*, Göttingen and Baltimore, 1920.

[11] Brown, to be sure, notes (p. 11*-12*) that the author had a "surprisingly weak feeling for rhyme"; for there are twenty-two non-rhyming lines, and at times unstressed syllables are used in rhyme. False rhymes in accented vowels, however, do not constitute a typical license in the *Pageants;* and the *seen-sign* type of rhyme is so common that the author can hardly have felt them imperfect.

Of the London pronunciation of this period, much has been written, but there is some uncertainty among scholars as to the exact pronunciation of *ē* and *ī*.[13] One fact, however, is evident: the two sounds were not pronounced alike. Viëtor points out that Shakespeare never makes such rhymes as *he* and *die*.[14] They do not appear in the 832 lines of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, nor in Chapman's 1616 additional lines, nor in Donne's five satires—although he is much given to doubtful rhymes. All of these poets come from the South of England: Chapman and Donne doubtless spoke the London English of the day; Marlowe may have intermixed some Kentish; and Shakespeare seems to have carried a few traces of Warwickshire dialect into his plays. It seems, therefore, fair to say that in London, and probably in most of the southern dialects, *ē* and *ī*, however they were pronounced, were clearly differentiated; whereas in Lancashire, they must have been very similar, if not exactly the same, in sound.

Although the *Shepheardes Calender* has many doubtful

In the 1048 lines of *Joseph*, it appears nine times; and, in the first thousand lines of the *Moses*, it appears sixteen times. I count the sound only when it appears under primary stress.

[12] Ed. Turnbull, London, 1856, 5-45.

[13] E.g. Bradley in *Shakespeare's England*, II, 542-3. Cf. Sweet, 234-5; Viëtor, I, 13 *et seq.*; Wyld, 71 *et seq.*, *et al.*

[14] Viëtor, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*, London, 1906, I, 14. Rhymes in unstressed or secondarily stressed *-y* or *-ie* are, of course, common; but vowels in atonic syllables are regularly "obscured" in English. It is only of stressed *ī* and *ē* that this paper takes account.

rhymes,[15] Spenser never rhymes *-ee-* and *-i-* in syllables bearing a primary stress: in the *April Eclogue*, indeed, he even prefers to repeat *green*, rather than substitute such a word as *fine*, which would have solved his technical difficulty at once.[16] The separate use of the two rhyme-sounds, moreover, is very common: in the 123 couplets of February, for example, there are fifteen rhymes in *i* and ten in *ee*[17]. If Spenser pronounced the two sounds similarly, in the fashion of Lancashire dialect, it is inconceivable that he should never once have rhymed them together. Further positive evidence, however, is not lacking: even when Spenser rhymes *-y* atonic, or with secondary stress as in *jollity*, with such words as *me* and *thee*, he regularly spells the *-y* as *-ee*,[18] showing thereby that he intended a slight change of pronunciation, even in that "obscured" vowel, and implying that such a change in pronunciation was necessary in order to make the rhyme accurate.[19] In *February*, moreover, Spenser actually follows a couplet rhyming *dye* and *enemie* with one rhyming *plea* and *lea*.[20] Surely, if these rhymes were exactly the same, he would not have chosen to repeat them, thus giving the effect of a quatrain in *aaaa*.

---

[15] *E.g. foeman* and *came*, *February*, 21-2; *loord* and *words*, *July*, 33, 35; *nyne* and *rhyme*, *November*, 53-5. In the *Pageants*, the doubtful rhymes seem to have been caused by the length of the line and the consequently weakened feeling for sound-repetition; but, in the *Calender*, the lines are usually rather short; and the reason for the bad rhymes must be sought rather in the inexperience of the poet and the difficulties of the form. *Vide Jour. Eng. Ger. Phil.*, XVIII, 560 *et seq.*

[16] *April*, 1 55 *et seq.*

[17] I count only cases where at least one rhyme bears an undoubted primary stress. The uncertainty of pronunciation of *-ea-* and of *-ie-* makes an exact count almost impossible.

[18] This change of spelling appears regularly in words of Romance origin where the *-y* stands for an O.F. *eị* or *é*. I find it in *February*, ll 207-8; *May*, ll 191-2, 221-2, 247-8; *June*, 97 *et seq.*, *September*, 50-51, 64-5, 238-39; *November*, 26 *et seq.*, 114 *et seq.* The one exception is, I suspect, a printer's error, *May*, 302-3. In rhyming *-ẏ* with *-y* or *-ye* or *-ie* under primary or secondary stress, he regularly spells the former *-y* or *-ye* or *-ie;* and he rhymes these rather indiscriminately with one another.

[19] *Cf. Jour. Eng. Ger. Phil.* XXVIII, 564: *e.g. behight* and *bynempt*. Spenser does not hesitate to vary spelling or grammar in the *Calendar* to make his rhymes.

[20] *February*, 1 155 *et seq.*

But one conclusion seems possible: that Spenser did not pronounce *i* and *ee* alike, in short, that in this respect at least, the phonology implied in the rhymes of the *Calender* is not Lancastrian, any more than is the grammar or the diction. Spenser, apparently, did not naturally speak Lancastrian; and, moreover, even when he was trying to imitate dialect, and largely Northern dialect at that, he did not know or at least did not care to use this striking phonological characteristic. The results of the present study reinforce the conclusions already apparent, that Grosart's argument for his Lancashire theory is quite unsound, and that his identification of Rosalind with a supposed Rose Dinley of North-East Lancashire, is an unsupported guess and nothing more.

JOHN W. DRAPER

University of Maine

REVIEWS AND NOTES

BEOWULF, AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE POEM WITH A DISCUSSION OF THE STORIES OF OFFA AND FINN. By R. W. Chambers. Cambridge University Press, 1921. xii+417 pp.

Now it can be told. The war-cloud has lifted, at least for the nonce, from that lively battle-ground of clashing conjectures and calculations, the field of *Beowulf* criticism. Of the contestants themselves, some have passed away, others, weary or without ammunition, have withdrawn from the strife, or else have patched up a truce. Hence it is possible not only to consider the sources of the war and to analyze the causes of contention, but to trace its varied campaigns and study its strategy, and finally to ask and answer the pertinent question, "What good came of it at last?" But the task of the historian is not easy, demanding all along the wordy way the happiest combination of two qualities, seemingly seldom mated, wide knowledge and balanced judgment. These qualifications, so essential to proper perspective, are duly applauded by Mr. Chambers in the regretted Björkman, and are found in no less measure in Mr. Chambers himself. His *Widsith* of ten years ago, in its exhaustive study of Old English heroic legend, bespoke a range as wide as his wanderer's. His revision of Wyatt's *Beowulf*, two years later, attested a conservatism and caution, a judicial habit of mind, that augured well for the then promised "Introduction" to the study of the poem. The promise has been well kept in the book of four hundred pages now before us.

Yet another and more genial quality, unusual in digests or summaries of any sort—I had almost said, in scholarly productions,—humanizes the study of origins. Mr. Chambers is not only a just judge, but so generous a one that he oft rejects and never once offends. The breadth of his outlook is matched by the largeness of his tone and temper. His graceful dedication to Professor W. W. Lawrence is not merely personal, but national in its friendly gesture of "hands across the sea." Moreover—and here good scholarship and good sportsmanship meet—the differences of opinion which compose his book are always traced with wisdom and courtesy to an initial common ground of agreement. Treated in this wise, competition becomes coöperation. Like De Quincey, who was wont "to take his pleasure in the Michelet woods," our critic, in true English wise, has "a rattlin' day's sport" on Grendel's trail through the shires, even when "this huntin' doesn't pay." This zest of the chase pervades the volume, like a blast of fresh air from the fields.

The book falls into four parts, not too closely coördinated. Indeed, Mr. Chambers himself would smilingly concede that his arrangement of material—divisions and subdivisions alike—is in no way inevitable, nor, indeed, mechanically plotted. Part I, a discussion of the historical and non-historical elements in the poem, and of theories as to its origin, date and structure, is copiously illustrated by the documentation of stories in Part II and interestingly supplemented by divers suggestive postscripts in Part IV, the Appendix. In Part III, "The Fight at Finnsburg," Finn, unlike his companion in the book's title, Offa, dominates, with his friends and his foes, an entire division. Genealogical tables of Danish and Gēat royalties properly preface the *Introduction* and an extensive bibliography of *Beowulf* and *Finnsburg* and an adequate index conclude it in workmanlike fashion.

From the mass of story-matter, disguised and indeed transformed by "the great camera-obscura, tradition," Mr. Chambers, with less credulity than either Professor Chadwick or Miss Clarke, seeks to segregate the component of fact. Beowulf himself may be sheer fable, but his environment, his allies and his enemies, are brought within space and time. "The Gēats are the Götar of Southern Sweden," thinks our editor, like everyone else, save those Danes, whose patriotic identification of the Gēat land with Jutland is considered by him with characteristic tolerance. With knowledge and skill, and with such conclusiveness as is possible in a world of conjecture, he arrays the Danish chieftains against their background of Leire. Through the maze of cousinships and the confusion of generations, he treads triumphantly not only here, but on the insecure ground of the Offas and their Angles, where pitfalls menace every step. The facile theory of Earle, which regards Thryth in *Beowulf* as "a mere fiction evolved from the historical Cynethryth, wife of Offa II, and by poetic license represented as the wife of his ancestor Offa I," is fairly stated and then fully overthrown. Indeed romance reverses Earle's process and converts an historical paragon of virtue, like Edward I's Eleanor many hundred years later, into a prodigy of vice.

No less unsafe is the footing when one surveys the non-historical elements in the poem (in the second chapter of the first part). Mr. Chambers finds little to link Beowulf the Gēat with Beow or with the culture-god's *doppelgänger*, Beowulf the Dane—ruling out of court without, perhaps, all his wonted warrant the propinquity of Beow and Grendel in the English place-names of the Charters—and hence rejects the seductive theory of Müllenhoff that would make of our hero a nature-myth, a deity struggling with wind and flood of early spring, and with the wild weather of late autumn. The sundry striking likenesses between the stories of Beowulf and Grettir, the Out-law of Iceland, are independently derived from one common original, presumably far back in their joint Germanic inheritance,—thus argues with sweet reasonableness our careful calculator of probabilities. He is not of the same mind as the doughty Danish champion, whom we all deplore, Axel Olrik, who sturdily denied any parallel between the adventures and personality of Beowulf and those of Bothvar Bjarki of the *Saga of Rolf Kraki*, and he points with conviction to the similarity of the heroic situations. Conversely, Mr. Chambers does not agree with Sievers, who has argued at length that the Danish story of Frotho's fight with the dragon is a close analogue to the final battle with the fire-drake in our poem. Folk-lore, particularly in the widely popular tale of the Bear's son, goes far to explain certain incidents and inconsistencies of our story, as Panzer has triumphantly demonstrated; but Mr. Chambers rightly remarks that the *Beowulf* and the *Grettir* story have 'many features in common which do not belong to the folk-tale.' With the entrance of Scef and Scyld the combat thickens. Shall we hold with Müllenhoff that Scyld Scefing means Scyld, son of Sceaf, or with Lawrence that the second name is not a patronymic, but must be read "with the sheaf?" With some reserves, Chambers shares the older view. Sceaf is no late creation entirely due to a misunderstanding of Scefing, but in the ninth century genealogies of the Anglo-Saxon Chronology (A° 855) his name leads all the rest. The reviewer concurs heartily with Mr. Chambers' conclusion that Scyld and Sceaf were both ancient figures standing at the head of famous dynasties, and were later connected, and influenced by each other.

Theories as to the origin, date and structure of the poem fill the thirty pages of the third chapter. Few of us, despite Sarrazin's enthusiastic advocacy of the translation theory which Sievers strenuously combated, and Schücking's recent contentions which Mr. Chambers himself weighs in the balance and rejects, will quarrel with the double verdict that "evidence to prove *Beowulf* a translation from a Scandinavian original is wanting," and that evidence against the theory is ample. The reviewer, himself an obstinate and blatant heretic in despite of many of the so-called tests of the time and place of the poem through the criteria of grammar, metre and syntax, is glad that Mr. Chambers seems to lay far less weight upon these supposedly significant variation of usage than, ten years ago, in his introduction to the *Widsith*, and to feel with this enemy of philological legend, that 'we must be cautious in the conclusions that we draw' from such usages. Present reaction against the assumptions of the "dissecting school" of Müllenhoff and Ten Brink is represented by Mr. Chambers, who has large reasons for his unbelief in the composition theory, even when it receives the backing of so skilful an advocate as Schücking in his study of ***Beowulf's Return***. Such trustworthy guides as Bradley and Chadwick have found the Christian elements incompatible with the rest of the poem; but our critic is justified in his insistence that this "incongruity" between traditional heathendom and the new holiness is only to be expected in an English writer of 700 A.D., and need not suggest that stalking shadow, the clerical interpolator. The poem, he thinks, is homogeneous—"a production of the Germanic world enlightened by the new faith."

We are grateful for the documentation in Part II of the volume. It is good to have within the compass of one hundred and twenty pages a dozen hitherto widely scattered illustrations of our story. Here are copious extracts from Saxo and Sagas, from the *Lives of the Offas* in the Cotton manuscripts. Mr. Chambers' admirable renderings of Icelandic prose, in their Saxon simplicity and directness, continue the best traditions of English translations from the Norse and are at once a valuable aid to the student and a forceful commentary upon the texts which they accompany. Only young *doctorandi* would disdain a like guide to the Latin analogues,—which are not all easy reading—but this neither space nor convention permitted.

In Part III, "The Fight at Finnsburg," Mr. Chambers seems less the judge and more the advocate than elsewhere in the book. As a destructive debater he has little difficulty in opposing strong objections to the views of those, who, like Möller and Chadwick, deem the treacherous Eotens Danish retainers of Hnæf or of those who, like Bugge, confound them with the Frisian followers of Finn. As a constructive pleader, he marshals weighty arguments, both historical and dramatic, to show that the problematic people are Jutes, adherents of Finn, who is not responsible for their treachery. On the basis of this theory, "which seems to fit in best with what we know of the historic conditions at the time when the story arose, and which fits in best with such details of the story as we have," the tale is skilfully reconstructed. Mr. Chambers thus muzzles the dogs of war—but, one fancies, only for a moment.

Part IV, the "Appendix," contains nearly a hundred pages of interesting material. Here is a postscript on Mythology, something more about the two Beowulfs and about Beow, the barley-god, whom we can connect, not with our Gēat hero, but with his Danish namesake. Here is an interesting discussion of Grendel place-names, which seem to point to a water-spirit—two meres, two pits, a mire and a beck. Next, a detailed examination of the West Saxon genealogy, involving so careful a survey of the even more intricate relationships of Chronicle versions, that the pedigree of the manuscripts divides interest with the manuscripts of the pedigree, and the provenance of B and C looms as large as the paternity of Woden. Entirely sound seems Mr. Chambers' contention that, in the family trees, "the names above Woden were added in Christian-times to the original list which, in heathen times, only went back to Woden, and which is still extant in this form." In a fourth division, the author gives large reasons, linguistic, literary, social, religious, for dating our poem about 700 A.D. rather than, with Schücking, two hundred years later; and somewhat cautiously subscribes to a belief in the classical schlarship of the poet. In a fifth section, Mr. Chambers re-opens the "Jute-question" to refute, at the cost of seemingly needless labor, the Danish chauvinism that continues to defy the laws of sound-change and the evidence of geography and history by identifying "Geats" and "Jutes." He then presents and rejects the inference, derived by Stjerna's translator, Clark Hall, from Stjerna's archaeological material, that the *Beowulf* is Scandinavian. "We must be careful not to read a Scandinavian coloring into features of *Beowulf*, which are at least as much English as Scandinavian, such as the ring-sword or the boar-helmet or the ring-corslet." After a survey of Germanic weapons and ships, the Appendix passes in review the recorded folk-tales of the Bear's son, that exhibit a real likeness to the *Beowulf-Grettir* story, and concludes with a brief note on the date of the death of Hygelac (525-530?).

Very helpful to the student is the comprehensive bibliography, thirty pages of fine print, including all books and articles dealing with the *Beowulf*, save the textual criticism or interpretation of single passages, and popular paraphrases and summaries, and containing good and terse comment. An adequate index closes this useful volume—a book essential not only to the specialist, but to every lover of our early literature, for it is a library in epitome, at once informative and judicial, a digest of various writings not easily accessible to many readers, and a discriminating commentary upon our present state of knowledge of our first epic. In make-up the *Introduction* is an "eye-pasture"—serviceably bound, beautifully printed, and delightfully illustrated, chiefly by the vivid Offa-drawings of the Cotton Nero manuscript.

FREDERICK TUPPER

University of Vermont

ALBERT HEINTZE: Die deutschen Familiennamen geschichtlich, geographisch, sprachlich. 5. verbesserte Auflage hgg. von Paul Cascorbi. Halle a. d. S., Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses 1922. VIII, 330 Stn. 8°

In aufopfernder Mühe hat Prof. Cascorbi eine neue Auflage von Heintzes Familiennamen veranstaltet, die das altbewährte Buch zum zuverlässigsten und kundigsten Führer durch eine

der anziehendsten Provinzen des deutschen Sprachlebens erhebt. In schwerer Zeit, unter ungünstigen Bibliotheksverhältnissen, neben der Last eines verantwortlichen Lehramts hat der verdiente Herausgeber seine Aufgabe gelöst und damit ein Anrecht auf den Dank aller Fachgenossen erworben. Wir meinen ihn nicht besser abstatten zu können, als indem wir künftigen Auflagen des trefflichen Buchs, die gewiss nicht ausbleiben werden, durch einige Beobachtungen vorzuarbeiten suchen, die wir in der alphabetischen Folge der behandelten Namen aneinanderreihen.

Ahn- wird durch die Verweisung auf **Agin** nicht erschöpft. Ahn ist auch ein Ortsname in Luxemburg, und von da geht der Familienname aus: Nik. Müller, Die Familiennamen des Grossherzogtums Luxemburg (1886) 17;35. In meinem Aufsatz "Familiennamen und frühneuhochdeutscher Wortschatz" (Hundert Jahre Marcus & Webers Verlag) 1919 S. 126 ist dieser Zusammenhang verkannt, ebenso bei Edw. Schröder, Anz. f.d. Alt. 39 (1920) 168, der in Ahn die Kurzform zu Arnold sieht, wie in Behn die zu Bernhard, in Wehn die zu Werner.—Schweiz. *Bärtschi* ist Kurzform zu Berthold.—*Bartholomäus* ist entstanden aus Bar Ptolemaeus "Sohn des Ptolemaeus."—*Bech* ist häufig in Luxemburg nach einem dortigen Ort.—*Beck* ist die im badischen Oberland geltende Form, im fränkischen Nordteil Badens gilt *Becker*.—Was hindert, in *Beringer* den Mann aus Beringen (Dorf in Lothringen) zu sehen, in *Böhringer* einen aus Böhringen (mehrfach in Baden und Württemberg)?—*Binz* ist ein Dorf in der Zürcher Pfarrei Mauer, das den Namen von den Binsen des Greifensees trägt. Deutlich nach ihm heisst **Uli von Binz,** der im Zürcher Steuerbuch von 1357 erscheint: Wh. Tobler=Meyer, Deutsche Familiennamen aus Zürich (1894) 135. Alem. *z* für gemeindeutsches *s* hält der bis heute im gesamten alemannischen Gebiet häufige Familienname Binz fest: Schweizerisches Idiotikon 4, 1412; H. Flamm, Geschichtliche Ortsbeschreibung der Stadt Freiburg (1903) 181; Matrikel der Universität Freiburg i.B.1, 554; Gg. Stoffel, Topographisches Wörterbuch des Ober=Elsasses (1876) 47 f. Als mundartgerechte Nebenformen treten Bünz und Bienz hinzu: H. Fischer, Schwäbisches Wörterbuch 1, 1124 f.; M. Lutz, Baslerisches Bürgerbuch (1819) 53.—*Brauch,* ein für Lahr in Baden kennzeichnender Name, meint den, der viel braucht, den Verschwender. Mit dem gleichen Suffix **-io** wie das eben genannte Beck und wie weiter Schnetz und Trösch neben gemeindeutschen Schnitzer und Drescher wird zuahd. **brûhhan** ein Nomen agentis ***brûhhio** gebildet, das appenzellisch heute noch in appellativem Gebrauch vorkommt (Schweiz. Id.5.364), zugleich aber auch die seit dem 14. Jahrhundert belegten Familiennamen Bruch, Bruchi, Bruchli liefert (das. 348). In Freiberg i.B. begegnet seit 1460 Bruch als Familienname

(Flamm 206. 250. 258. 261), seit 1775 die patronymische Ableitung Brüchig, Brichig (das. 142. 278), heute Brauch, Brauchle, Bruch, Brüchig.—Unter *Braunabend* wäre zu sagen, dass braun in dieser Floskel der zweiten schlesischen Dichterschule 'violett' bedeutet: Zs.f.d. Wortf. 12, 200 f.—Im Grossherzogtum Luxemburg gab es bei der Volkzählung von 1880 79 *Clemen*, 181 Clemens, 294 Clément: Nik. Müller 46. Clemen als deutscher Familienname ist, wie hier sichtbar wird, derart entstanden, dass sich ein deutscher Clemens romanisierte zu Clément und dann deutsch aussprach.—Die aus früheren Auflagen übernommene Erklärung von *Dreizehner* muss wohl der besseren weichen, die von der Behördenorganisation mittelalterlicher Städte ausgeht: Elfer, Zwölfer, Dreizehner, Fünfzehner, Zwanziger sind ursprünglich Mitglieder eines Ausschusses von 11, 12, 13, 15, 20 Köpfen.—Bei *Fliedner* lässt sich ausser an den Ort Flieden in Hessen auch an mhd. **diu flite** "Lasseisen" denken.—Zu den Ableitungen von Flühe "Felsen" tritt der im badischen Lahr häufige Familienname *Flüge*, vermittelt durch oberelsässische Flurnamen wie **Flieg** und **Flügen:** Stoffel 165 f.—Zu Abraham gehört im alten Frankfurt a. M. **Afrom** als jüdischer Vorname: Adelheid Schiff, Namen der Frankfurter Juden (1917) 18. Mit Kürzung des unbetonten Anlauts ist daraus **From** geworden: O. Meisinger, Wörterbuch der Rappenauer Mundart (1906) 33. Damit ist **Fromm** als jüdischer Familienname erklärt.—*Gervasius* mit seiner Kurzform *Fäsi* verdiente Aufnahme. Die Verweisung von Vaes—auf Servatius ist wohl auf Gervasius umzulenken.—*Grieb* ist aus altem Uebernamen zum Familiennamen geworden und stellt sich zu ahd. **griobo** "ausgeschmorter Fettwürfel": Socin, Mittelhochdeutsches Namenbuch (1903) 143; Fischer 3, 829; Flamm 191; 230; 260 f.—Die Auffassung von *Halbrehder* als "Halbritter" wird gestützt durch den Familiennamen *Halbedel*, der in Thür, Kreis Mayen an der Mosel, heimisch ist.—*Heineck* mit seinen Nebenformen und Latinisierungen wie Hayneccius ist böhmische Koseform zu Ignaz.—*Himstedt* ist in Freiburg als Familienname aus Norddeutschland zugewandert. Ein Dorf gleichen Namens liegt zwischen Hildesheim und Braunschweig, es ist nach E. Förstemann, Deutsche Ortsnamen, 3. Aufl. 1, 1191 alt bezeugt in den Formen **Hemstide, Heemstede,** bedeutet also ursprünglich "**domicilium,**" wie ags. **hámstede,** fries. **hamsted.**—Mit der anzüglichen Deutung von *Hindelang* ist leider ein Irrtum aus meinen Familiennamen im badischen Oberland (1918) 61 in Cascorbis neue Auflage übergegangen. Hindel (w)ang(en) und Hindelbank sind Ortsnamen in den gleichen Landschaften, die Hinde(n)lang als Familiennamen kennen.—Neben *Hirschsprung* begegnet der gleichbedeutende Name *Hertzsprung*.—Zu den Namen mit Apfel im zweiten Teil tritt *Hochapfel* in Strassburg.—Deutlich von der Tracht genommen ist der am

Niederrhein heimische Fn. *Hochgürtel*, eine wundervoll sinnkräftige Bildung.—*Holzadel* ist mit dem Prädikat "halbniederdeutsch" aus der 4. Auflage übernommen, aber wie soll ein hd. Holzsattel im Nd. anders heissen als Holt-sadel (ts = z)? Eingeordnet ist die Form allerdings, als hiesse sie Holz-sadel.—*Jehle* habe ich Familiennamen im badischen Oberland 6 über Ůelin aus Ulrich entwickelt. Ich zweifle, ob es sich je als einstämmige Kürzung zu Geilhard wird erweisen lassen.—*Johl* ist in Rust bei Ettenheim jüdischer Fn. und wird von Socin 561 f. mit überzeugenden Belegen auf hebr. Joël zurückgeführt.—Dem deutschen Stein entspricht poln. *Kamin* auch in Orts = und Familiennamen. Stein von Kaminski wandelt den Begriff in beiden Sprachen ab, die Kamecke auf Usedom stammen aus dem nd. verkleinerten Slavenort Camminke.—Zu den mannichfachen Endformen des kirchlichen Taufnamens Kyriakus tritt *Kiliusl* in Lahr und Freiburg, hier schon 1460 als **Cilius** bezeugt (Flamm 19).—*Kleineibst* als Fn. geht aus vom Namen des Dorfs Klein-Eibstadt bei Königshofen im Grabfeld.—Die lange umstrittene Bedeutung von *Lahr* ist endgültig zu gunsten von "Weide" entschieden durch Joseph Schnetz, Das Lâr = Problem. Schulprogramm Lohr a.M. 1913.—Bei *Mangold* springt die innere Verwandtschaft mit griech. Πολυκράτης in die Augen.—*Morstadt*, häufig im badischen Lahr, ist der Mann aus dem Weiler Marstatt bei Messelhausen, Amtsbezirk Tauberbischofsheim, der alt stets **Morstat** heisst: Albert Krieger, Topographisches Wörterbuch des Grossherzogtums Baden, 2. Aufl. 2, 152.—*Mozart* ist in Luxemburg heute noch ein geläufiger Fn.: Nik. Müller 32; 87.—*Nirrnheim* und *Nirrheim* deuten sich als "Nirgends daheim."—*Nissl* dürfte bei den einstämmigen Kürzungen zu **Nid-** zu streichen und allein bei Dionysius zu belassen sein.—Bapst ist in Zürich seit 1386 Fn.: Schweiz. Id. 4, 1427 f. Dass er alter Uebername ist, nicht etwa vom Hausnamen ausgeht, zeigen die Belege dort, z. B. ein aargauisches Brüderpaar von 1470: **Hensly und Ruedy, die bäpst.** Die obd. Formen setzen mhd. **babest** voraus, in Schwaben ist heute **bǫbscht** gangbar: Fischer 1, 550. In Lahr hat sich der damit gedeutete Fn. *Posth* entwickelt.—*Primus* als kirchlicher Taufname hat den Freiburger Fn. Briem geliefert. Er beginnt hier 1460 mit **Peter Brim, Murer** (Flamm 277), 1494 folgt **Ludwig Brim** (das. 115), 1540 wird **Udalricus Brim ex Fryburgo** immatrikuliert (Freib. Matrikel 1, 324).—*Püttrich* ist früh missdeutet worden: der bekannte Püterich von Reichertshausen (+1470) führt einen Bottich im Wappen.—Die Häufigkeit des Namens *Richter* gilt nicht für den deutschen Südwesten. Das Freiburger Adressbuch für 1921 kennt nur 16 Richter, die Vogt, Vögtle(r) und Vögtlin sind weit häufiger.—*Rothmund* und *Rotermund* sind wohl unter Rothe zu streichen und nur bei Hrôþis zu belassen.—Der Artikel *Russwurm* ist in glücklicher

Weise berichtigt. Die Bedeutungen "Schmied, Schlosser" lassen sich stützen aus Fischer 5, 499, Hnr. Klenz Scheltenwb. (1910) 126 und den dort angeführten Stellen. Auch als Adelsname wurzelt Russworm in mitteldeutscher Mundart, die ihrerzeits das Wort aus dem Rotwelschen bezogen haben kann. Bei *Salzer* fügt die neue Auflage zu dem früher einzigen Ansatz "Einsalzer" fragweise den andern: "Salzhändler." Er lässt sich stützen aus K. Bücher, Die Berufe der Stadt Frankfurt a.M. im Mittelalter (1914) 112, wo **selzer** seit 1300 regelmässig in der Bedeutung "Salzverkäufer" nachgewiesen ist.—*Schellkopf* bedeutet schwerlich "Kopf des Schelchs," vielmehr einen, der im Kopf schellig, d.i. aufgeregt ist: Deutsches Wörterbuch 8, 2501.—Bei *Schleinzer* bleibt auch Herkunft aus Schleinitz zu erwägen: Huhn, Topogr. Lexikon 5 (1849) 860 nennt 7 Dörfer und Weiler dieses Namens in Österreich, Preussen und Sachsen.—Der gewerbsmässige Veranstalter von Glücksspielen und Aufseher über solche heisst mhd. **scholderer:** Lexer 3, 766 f., nachmals oft verkürzt zu **Scholder:** Deutsches Wörterbuch 9, 1450. Daraus ist z.B. in Lahr der Fn. *Scholder* entstanden, Karlsruhe (mit Angleichung von ld zu ll) *Scholler*, im alten Reutlingen **Schölderli(ng), Schelderlin:** Freiburger Matrikel 108 ff., im heutigen Württemberg *Scholter:* Fischer 5, 1098.—*Stolterfoth* ist nicht "stolzer, stattlicher Fuss," sondern gehört mit Stuhfath,—farth,—fauth zu Stollfuss (Deutsches Wörterbuch 10 III 215) und bezeichnet den Schleppfüssigen.—Neben *Streicher* ist auch *Strick(l)er* aus älterem Gewerbenamen zum Fn. geworden. Zur Verbreitung der verschiedenen Seilernamen s.Leo Ricker, Zs.f.d. Mundarten 15 (1920) 99 ff.—*Tilk* in Lahr, *Dilger* in Freiburg, *Tilger* in Augsburg stellen sich zum Ortsnamen Ottilien. Tilg ist die alte Kurzform zum Frauennamen Ottilie, die sich auch im schwäbischen Flurnamen **Tilghäuslein** erhalten hat: Fischer 2, 208.—*Warneyer* ist der Mann aus Warnau an der unteren Havel.—*Weibezahn* möchte man den Schweifwedlern anschliessen, die sonst Weibezahl heissen, und die Deutung "Wackelzahn" streichen.—Zu *Wursthorn* als Übernamen des Metzgers ist auf Schweiz. Id. 2, 1617 und 1625 zu verweisen, wo das Gerät und seine Verwendung geschildert werden.

Neu aufgenommen zu werden verdienten die Namen *Batt* (alemannische Entwicklung zu dem gleichfalls fehlenden Taufnamen Beatus); *Bolza* (in Freiburg 1874 eingewandert, häufiger italienischer Fn.); *Consentius; Dees* (zu den im Anlaut verkürzten Formen von Matthäus); *Dehio; Enneccerus; Erbschlöh* (in und um Köln, zum Weiler Erbschlöe südlich von Barmen); *Gesenius; Gluck; Judeich,* nd. *Judick; Kurs* (neben Cohrs, Kohrs, Coërs); *Leander* (Übersetzung von Volkmann); *Leidenroth* (in Leipzig, dahin wohl aus Schweden gelangt, wo die Fn. gern auf **-rot** "Wurzel" enden); *Lessing; Leverkinck* (kleine

Lerche?); *Liefmann* (zu Livland oder Levi?); *Mollenbott; Natorp; Nernst; Petschke* (nd. Verkleinerung zu Pätsch); *Peckruhn* (in Dresden, wohl zu den littauischen Fn. auf **-uhn**); *Pernice; Piloty; Rosenlächer,-lecher* (wohl eins mit Rosenlehner); *Schapiro; Silbergleit; Spirgatis* (wieder littauisch); *Tholuck; Treibs* (zu den im Anlaut gekürzten Formen von Andreas); *Trübner; Uchthoff; Umbreit; Unwerth; Vigener* (Nachkomme eines Friedrich); *Windelband; Zenker.*

Verweisungen sind erwünscht von A(e)ngenheister auf An; von Eisentraut auf S. 38; von Lepsius auf Philipp; von Liebig auf Leubhas; von Pross auf Ambrosius; von Teuchers auf Þenhan; von Thorbecke auf Bach; von Weber auf Textor. Die westgermanischen Ansätze sind in der 5. Auflage vielfach geändert, z.B. **Auđaʒ,** in **Audhas, Hađuʒ,** in **Hadhus**. Die neuen Schreibungen sind nun auch in den Verweisungen durchzuführen, während es jetzt noch heisst: Aubel s. **Auđaʒ,** Hebbel s.**Hađuʒ,** und so sehr oft. Im Quellenverzeichnis fehlt das z.B. S.61 benutzte Karlsruher Namenbuch von C. Wilh. Fröhner, Karlsruhe 1856, manche andere Erweiterung ergibt sich aus den oben beigezogenen Werken. Druckfehler sind selten: $107^{b}34$ lies Auslaut, 36 Anlaut; $118^{a}26$ Schultze; $123^{a}13$ Pertsch; $135^{a}13$ daʒ, statt das; $215^{b}24$ niederdeutsch; $231^{b}25$ ahd. statt mhd.; $272^{a}45$ Rotzel statt Rötzel; $296^{a}31$ Stichling; $329^{b}5$ Zum Hofe; $330^{b}18$ Stalder statt Stadler.

Die deutsche Namenkunde ist so reich gegliedert und so mannichfach entwickelt wie die deutsche Landschaft. Bisher sind vorweigend norddeutsche Forscher am Werk gewesen, auch bei dem vorliegenden Werk. So ist es nicht schwer, vom süd=und westdeutschen Standpunkt allerhand Nachträge zu geben, die das Gesamtbild bereichern und manche Auffassung verschieben können. Die Absicht ist dabei nicht, das Geleistete irgend wie herabzusetzen, sondern einzig, dem Buch voranzuhelfen und ihm neue Freunde zu werben. Dazu aber ist im Grund jeder berufen, der einen germanischen Namen führt, gleichviel wie er lautet, wann oder wo er ihn erworben hat und unter welchem Himmel er ihn trägt.

ALFRED GÖTZE

Freiburg (*Baden*)

JOSEF WIEHR: KNUT HAMSUN: His Personality and his Outlook upon Life. Smith College Monographs in Modern Languages, III, Nos. 1–2. Northampton, 1922. Pp. 130

In 1888 Knut Hamsun published his first book. *Fra det moderne Amerikas Aandsliv.* The thesis of this brilliant and sardonic performance is delightfully simple: There is no culture in America. That was before out literary awakening of course, before Mencken and Sandburg and Sherwood Anderson and

Van Wyck Brooks. Hamsun said then of these states pretty much what these men are saying, only he said it with an elemental energy of which they are incapable—perhaps they are Americans all in spite of themselves. For in Hamsun there is no hint of literary smartness, of sophisticated preciosity shot through with commonplace. There is insight, and a comprehension which even his fierce contempt cannot dim. One wonders just a little what these critics of American life would say of Hamsun's contribution to their symposium: there can be little doubt what Hamsun would say of them if he were to bring *Amerikas Aandsliv* down to date.

Still, even if he were to annihilate them as he annihilated Whitman, he could not fail to see that the intellectual life of America has changed since the eighties, changed perhaps even more than the American scene. Can anyone imagine *Pan* and *Hunger* commercially successful in this country a generation ago? Or, for the matter of that, even *Growth of the Soil?* No doubt much of Hamsun's success is adventitious. We read him, many of us, because he was once a streetcar conductor in Chicago and a "wobbly"—if such beings were then—in North Dakota, or because some academy or other, or was it a Mr. Nobel?—has awarded him a prize of forty thousand dollars. The piquant and the spectacular are mighty yet in the land of Barnum. None the less there is a genuine public for Hamsun here, with eyes to read and brains to understand. Thirty years ago he would have gone the way of Ibsen, become the icon of a cult—if he had been read at all.

Professor Wiehr therefore has done a great service in giving us this thorough and painstaking monograph. It surveys Hamsun's works in chronological order from the juvenilia of his Bodø days (1878) to *Konerne ved Vandposten* (1920). And the survey includes not merely a summary of contents, for the most part excellent, but an analysis of the work, a study of characters, style, and setting, and an attempt at least to fit each succeeding book into a synthesis of Hamsun's outlook upon life. Certainly such a task well done is most useful, and on the whole Professor Wiehr has done it well. The reader will gain much useful information and a sense too of what it is that Hamsun in novel after novel is trying to do. But one is compelled to say that in this more difficult task of revealing the substance of Knut Hamsun, the critic only imperfectly succeeds.

To begin with, the chronological order is most unfortunate. It is at once monotonous and confusing. Each novel, for instance, becomes an isolated phenomenon, to be analyzed by itself, so that when one has read to the end one cannot see the woods for the trees. The author has no doubt been conscious of this defect in his method, for he tries constantly to link one work with another and with some basic idea, and at the end he attempts a synthesis, which, I must confess, seems to me too dispersed and loose to be very illuminating. One thinks of John Landquist's brief study, in which in a little more than a hundred pages that fine critic makes one see the guiding principle of all that Hamsun has written—an intense insistence on the sovereignty of the soul. Professor Wiehr sees it too; but the reader is very likely to miss it.

And he will miss in these solid pages the magic that is Hamsun—the lyric intoxication of the early novels, the less obvious, no less pervasive poetry of his later style. In great part that is inevitable, for the witchery of one language cannot be rendered in another; but he will miss it no less because of a certain stodginess in the critic's own style and treatment. Landquist speaks at the close of his essay of the golden pillar of youth that shines through Hamsun's work like a sun-glade upon dark and troubled waters. Has Professor Wiehr ever caught a glimpse of it? And has he journeyed "out upon the sunglade into the infinite"? One is tempted to doubt it. He knows his Hamsun well, no doubt, but he has never been possessed by him, moved to the depths of being by that luminous, haunting prose. Or if he has, his monograph never once betrays him. Perhaps style and the glow of imagination are not to be sought in an academic publication. But criticism that lacks them must needs fall short of what it might have been, and ought to be.

Professor Wiehr's account of Hamsun's life builds upon the usual materials, among others, on a little article of mine that appeared some years ago in *Scandinavian Studies.* In that article I gave an account, taken from the *Autobiography* of Professor R. B. Anderson of an encounter between Hamsun and him on a Thingvalla liner in the summer of 1888. Some months after the article appeared I received through a friend of Hamsun's in California a letter in which Hamsun vehemently denies the truth of Mr. Anderson's narrative of the relations between them, and, presumably, though he does not expressly mention it, of the episode I used. Of course I had no means of appraising its accuracy, I used it in good faith because it seemed striking and apposite. But it is simple justice to Hamsun to publish his disavowal of it.

After all, as Hamsun himself says in his letter, it matters very little what tales may pass current about him. He lives, not in these, but in his work, and it is there that we have to seek him. It is Professor Wiehr's distinction to have given the first comprehensive study of that work in English. And for that we are grateful.

MARTIN B. RUUD

The University of Minnesota

THE SEPULCHRE OF CHRIST IN ART AND LITURGY, by Neil C. Brooks, University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Volume VII, Number 2, Urbana, 1921.

The basis for this admirable monograph is the familiar fact that during a long period an important center of dramatic activity in the mediaeval church was the structure, or *locus*, known as the Easter *sepulchrum*. At this Easter sepulchre were performed three liturgico-dramatic offices: "the *Depositio* (*Crucis*, or *Hostiae*, or *Crucis et Hostiae*) of Good Friday, symbolizing and commemorating the Entombment, the *Elevatio*, in which the buried symbol or symbols were raised early on Easter morning in commemoration of the Resurrection, and the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, later on Easter morning, representing the visit of the Maries to the tomb after the Resurrection."[1] The precise aim of the author may be clearly known from his own words at the outset:[2]

> The purpose of this study is to bring together and interpret, as far as possible, the essential facts about the sepulchre as known from art, architecture, and archives, and from liturgical rubrics. The study is an outgrowth of interest in the liturgic drama and is to be viewed primarily as an attempt to enlarge our knowledge of the *mise en scène* of the liturgical Easter plays, i.e., the dramatico-liturgical versions of the *Visitatio* and *Elevatio*.

For explaining the nature of the Easter sepulchre as *mise en scène* for the dramatic offices there are, then, four principal kinds of evidence: representations in art, archaeological remains, archival records, and the rubrics of the dramatic pieces themselves. Of these several sources of information a certain number of previous writers have fairly mastered, let us say, one or two; and a few writers have shown some general acquaintance with all four. Professor Brooks, however, is the first scholar known to me who has effectually grasped all four sorts of evidence, with the result of producing a treatise which was greatly needed, and which almost no one else could have accomplished. It was to be expected that preceding archaeologists and historians of art should expound the *sepulchrum* in its structure and appearance; and this task one scholar or another has performed for certain periods and localities. But a survey of this matter for both East and West, covering the whole period from the first century to the sixteenth, is provided for the first time in the work before us. On the other hand, whereas one could not expect archaeologists and historians of art to possess the minute literary and liturgical information necessary for interpreting the dramatic offices performed at the *sepulchrum*, Professor Brooks fully possesses just this information, gained through some two decades of notable success in editing and explaining unpublished texts of the liturgico-dramatic offices of Easter.

---

[1] Brooks, p. 30.

[2] Brooks, p. 8.

For the precise task under consideration, then, Professor Brooks is most happily competent.[3]

From this competence derives, naturally enough, the lucidity of the treatise in its several parts, and that organization of the whole which allows a reviewer to comment upon the chapters in the simple order of the text.

After a brief introductory statement in Chapter One, the exposition proper begins in Chapter Two ("The Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem"). In this section, using the ample evidences of Heisenberg and others, Professor Brooks concisely reviews the architectural arrangements of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and traces the vicissitudes of these structures from the period when Constantine (probably) erected the circular *Anastasis* over the Sepulchre, down through the period of the Crusaders, when the buildings took substantially their present complex form. The subject of this short chapter is presented with a clarity that is fortunate in view of the inevitable references to it in later parts of the treatise. Particularly clear to the reader are the disposition of the tomb itself, and the persistence of the rotunda (Anastasis) over it. One is mildly surprised, perhaps, at the author's somewhat casual tone in referring to the *Peregrinatio Etheriae*,[4] which must always rank among the most authoritative and illuminating expositions of ecclesiological and liturgical matters in Jerusalem in the fourth century and thereabouts. Possibly appropriate quotations from this document might have enriched the exposition.

In Chapter Three ("The Sepulchre of Christ in Art") Professor Brooks surveys the representations of the Sepulchre in art throughout the mediaeval period. The earliest examples are of the fourth and fifth centuries. From this period until the twelfth century the scene in which the Sepulchre appears is that of the Maries encountering the angel at the empty tomb. After the twelfth century the Maries give way before a representation of the Resurrection itself. The present chapter, then, treats especially the representations of the Holy Women at the tomb. Of these representations there are two broad classes: the Eastern and the Western. The eastern examples may be divided into the Syro-Palestinian type and the Byzantine. The Syro-Palestinian type seems to have arisen in the sixth century, in close association with the cult of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. The scene centers in the tomb itself, which represents, more or less faithfully, the actual Holy Sepulchre of the period of Constantine. The Byzantine type shows the angel as the center of the composition, with a subordinated

[3] See, for example, *Zeitschrift fur deutsches Altertum*, Vol. L (1908), pp. 297-312; *id.*, Vol. LV (1914), pp. 52-61; *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. VIII (1909), pp. 464-488; *id.*, Vol. X (1911), pp. 191-196.

[4] See Brooks, p. 11, note 7.

sepulchre in the form of a rock-hewn tomb, of a sarcophagus before an opening into the rock, or of a simple sarcophagus surmounted by a ciborium, or canopy. In the Western representations the sepulchre takes the form of a cylindrical tower, or of a tower-temple in two or more stories, or of a coffer-tomb. The tower-like forms,—notably dissimilar both to the rock tomb of the Gospels and to the actual Sepulchre at Jerusalem,—show a possible influence from the circular Anastasis over the Holy Sepulchre itself, and a more probable influence from the tower-like tombs used generally in antiquity and in early Christian times.

Although I cannot speak as an expert in iconography, I venture to commend unreservedly the comprehensive scope of this chapter, the lucidity of the exposition, and the generous illustration of the text through photographic plates.

Chapter Four ("The Relation of the Sepulchre in Art to the Architecture of the Altar") "is in the nature of an excursus to consider a theory advanced by Dr. J. K. Bonnell."[5] Dr. Bonnell contended that the Christian altar had a potent influence upon the form of the Sepulchre of Christ as it appears both in art and in the *mise en scène* of the dramatic offices, *Depositio*, *Elevatio*, and *Visitatio*. In the present chapter Professor Brooks addresses himself to the alleged relations of the altar and the representation of the sepulchre in art.

Professor Bonnell emphasizes his observation that, among the representations of the sepulchre, those that show a marked resemblance to the altar surmounted by a ciborium, or canopy, outnumber those in the other groups of his classification.[6] This observation Professor Brooks combats by showing, for example, that of a hundred or more accessible pictures of all types of sepulchre, Professor Bonnell used only some sixteen, and, further, that of the ten representations that seem to Professor Bonnell to show a resemblance between altar and sepulchre, at least one-half are interpreted erroneously.[7] In these particular contentions Professor Brooks easily wins one's assent. The incompleteness of Professor Bonnell's evidence is now obvious; and his interpretation of the painting in Hartker's *Liber Responsalis* as a direct imitation of the altar,[8] for example, is scarcely admissible after one has compared it with the representations of temple-sepulchres (particularly that shown in Figure 14),[9] the history of which Professor Brooks has amply outlined.

---

[5] The study of the late Professor Bonnell referred to is entitled *The Easter Sepulchrum in its Relation to the Architecture of the High Altar*, and it is found in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XXXI, pp. 664-712.

[6] See Bonnell, pp. 700-712.

[7] See Brooks, pp. 27-29.

[8] See Bonnell, pp. 704-706.

[9] This ivory in the South Kensington Museum was not used by Professor Bonnell.

But although Professor Bonnell's demonstration cannot stand upon the evidence that he himself adduces, my impression is that the possibility of influence from the altar upon the sepulchre in art has not been definitively removed,—an impression that receives some support from the generous materials provided by Professor Brooks himself. I cannot argue the matter in detail here, and I am far from pretending to proficiency in this branch of the general subject; but I venture to mention a few relevant facts and to utter one or two queries. Professor Brooks candidly refers to a certain number of representations of the sepulchre with ciboria over them; but since these examples are almost all Eastern, he assigns them to the Syro-Palestinian type, which "is doubtless in imitation of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem, and hence is not reminiscent, or in imitation of the altar ciborium."[10] Has any one yet proved, however, that the form of the Holy Sepulchre itself was not influenced by the forms of early Christian altars? And is it finally certain that the Syro-Palestinian type was free from the influence of the altar, either through the Holy Sepulchre or independently of it? Professor Brooks observes also that a ciborium such as that seen in the mural paintings of S. Angelo in Formis (Fig. 6) "may possibly stand in close relation to Eastern altar ciboria."[11] But since ciboria of this particular type seem not to have occurred in the church architecture of the West, Professor Brooks implies that Western representations of the sepulchre with canopy could scarcely show the influence of an altar canopy.[12] Is it certain, however, that Eastern altar canopies could not have influenced the form of Western sepulchre canopies? If such questions are not captious, they may serve as an indication that the possible relations of sepulchre in art and the Christian altar have not yet been definitively expounded. Controversy aside, I myself frankly desire more information concerning early Christian altars in relation to the sepulchre in art and to the Easter sepulchre as a structure, and I surmise that in such works as Rohault de Fleury's *La Messe*[13] can be found useful *data* not brought forward by Professor Brooks or Professor Bonnell. Professor Brooks would greatly please us all if he would apply his remarkable special learning to an article on this particular subject.

The interest of students of literature will center inevitably in Chapter V ("Liturgical Ceremonies at the Sepulchre"), for here the author treats those dramatic or quasi-dramatic liturgical offices that have long been recognized as being among the origins of modern drama. These are the *Depositio*, *Elevatio*, and *Visitatio*, referred to above. In this special branch of the subject Professor Brooks has long been an acknowledged authority; and in view of the importance of this particular matter, and in view of the author's superior equipment for elucidating it, I am glad to report that this chapter is the longest and most exhaustive in the volume.

---

[10] See Brooks, p. 29.

[11] See Brooks, p. 29.

[12] See Brooks, p. 29.

[13] C. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe: Études archéologiques sur ses Monuments*, 8 vols., Paris, 1883–1889.

Professor Brooks begins with a discussion of the origin of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio*. Referring most generously to a study of my own,[14] he carefully reviews my positions in this special matter. As possible influences toward the formation of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* I have advanced these four:[15] (1) the processional reservation of the Host for the *Missa Praesanctificatorum* of Good Friday, (2) the symbolism associated with the altar and vessels used in various reservations of the Host, (3) the *Adoratio Crucis* of Good Friday, inevitably concluding with a ceremonial suggesting the *Depositio*, and (4) a certain papal ceremonial on Easter morning which shows resemblances to the *Elevatio*. Of these alleged influences, the only one in which Professor Brooks finds substantial force is the third: the ceremonial of the *Adoratio Crucis*. In choosing this ceremonial for emphasis he discriminates, I think, correctly. In any case he selects the influence that is most readily demonstrable, since in certain versions the *Depositio* is attached directly to the *Adoratio*, as a sequel.

Although Professor Brooks is inclined to dismiss my other proposals, I should scarcely be human, I suppose, were I not to linger over them wistfully for an instant. My suggestion of influence from the papal ceremonial of Easter morning seems to him "unnecessary and rather improbable, in view of the fact that *Depositio* and *Elevatio* doubtless originated north of the Alps."[16] To me this disposition of the matter seems fair enough. Although I should have been glad to have Professor Brooks mention the undeniable resemblances between the papal ceremonial and the *Elevatio*, and although I see no impossibility in an influence from papal Rome upon ceremonials north of the Alps, I agree with him in viewing this possible influence as relatively unimportant.

---

[14] This study is *The Dramatic Associations of the Easter Sepulchre* (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 10, Madison, 1920). In apologizing for referring to myself in the course of this review I must lay the responsibility upon Professor Brooks, who has graciously drawn attention to my study, by ample commendation and notable corrections. In order both to explain Professor Brook's procedure in this chapter, and to acknowledge a valued compliment from him, I venture to quote his words (p. 30): "At the time that this chapter was planned and the material for it brought together, there was no satisfactory study of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio*. Since then there has appeared an excellent study of their development by Professor Karl Young, with a goodly number of new texts. It becomes my purpose therefore to add some new data to his and to discuss upon the basis of the combined material, certain aspects of the development of these two ceremonies."

[15] See Young, pp. 9-29.

[16] See Brooks, p. 32, note 8.

As to the influence of the Thursday-Friday reservation and of the symbolism attached to altar, chalice, and pyx I cannot yield so readily. Although I grant at once that for this influence I can offer no direct demonstration, I cannot ignore the clear parallelism between the ceremonial of the *Depositio-Elevatio* and the older ceremonial of carrying the Host to an altar, or other "place of repose," on Holy Thursday, and taking the Host up from this revered *locus* on Good Friday; nor can I ignore the symbolism that undeniably marked the altar and vessels as *sepulchra*.[17] All I can do at present is to confess that I have no document asserting that the creators of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* were consciously influenced by the reservation and the symbolism; but I must also declare that I see no likelihood of their escape from a model so conspicuous and a symbolic suggestion so pervasive.

Having discussed the origins of the dramatic ceremonials under consideration, Professor Brooks provides a classified list of "all the texts available for the study of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio*." Particularly acceptable in this list are the extensions and corrections of the data found in my own publication already referred to. The careful inclusiveness of the new list is such that for many years students of this subject must use it as a point of departure. This or that reviewer will inevitably add a stray text or two from recondite printed sources; but I surmise that such additions will not be numerous or weighty. The value of the list is further increased through the arranging of texts according to countries and according to the object, or objects, used for the "burial" (Cross, Host, or Cross and Host). The list provides information also concerning the position of each text in the liturgy. From this able compilation the author effectually draws fresh conclusions as to geographical distribution, and as to prevailing local types.

Professor Brook's acute attention to the texts themselves is seen, for example, in his useful elucidation of the occasional expression *Imago Crucifixi* for the object placed in the *sepulchrum*. This expression,—puzzling to me in my study of the matter,[18]—is shown to mean, in all probability, "an image of Christ not attached to a cross."[19] With similar acumen the author points to the interesting fact that the Host seems to have been considered inappropriate for the *Depositio*, and that at times the Host was not put into the *sepulchrum* with the cross on Friday, but was placed there on Easter morning, immediately before the *Elevatio*, for use only in this latter observance.[20]

---

[17] Professor Brooks (pp. 21, 61) recognizes the existence of this symbolism.

[18] See Young, p. 109.

[19] See Brooks, pp. 37-40.

The closing pages of this valuable chapter[21] deal vigorously with two modern developments connected with the *sepulchrum:* the "heilige Gräber" and the "false" sepulchre. In churches in which the ceremonials of the sepulchre continued into the Renaissance there developed in connection with the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* a special exposition of the Host. In modern Germany the sepulchre of Holy Week seems to be used primarily as a base for the monstrance of the exposition. Since the Host is a symbol of rejoicing, the use of "heilige Gräber" for the exposition is distinctly uncanonical.

Another violation of strict liturgical tradition is the use of the term "sepulchre" for the "place of respose" in which the Host for the *Missa Praesanctificatorum* is kept from Holy Thursday to Good Friday. Professor Brooks discriminates ably between this "false" sepulchre and the "true" *sepulchrum* of the liturgico-dramatic offices.[22]

Chapter Six ("The Location of the Sepulchre in the Church") is brief, and may be briefly reviewed. Professor Brooks finds that in England the *sepulchrum* "seems to have been always in the north side of the chancel," and in France, "usually in the choir, or chancel, either at a specially prepared Sepulchre or about the altar serving as a sepulchre."[23] In Germany and in Italy, on the other hand, the *sepulchrum* was commonly placed outside the choir. These conclusions the author supports by an adequate citation of documents.

With Chapter Seven ("The Nature of the Sepulchre in Continental Churches") Professor Brooks begins his thoroughgoing description of the actual physical structures used as *mise en scène* for the dramatic ceremonials that have been completely considered in Chapter Five. The present chapter considers the sepulchres used on the Continent, the evidence being found chiefly in the rubrics of the dramatic ceremonials themselves.

The author finds evidence for the following types:[24]

> "1. The high altar, either merely suggestive of the sepulchre, where, as in the *Resurrexi* tropes, there was no real action, or actually representing it in the *Visitatio*.
>
> "2. Some vessel or small structure on the high altar, generally or always with a veil or cloth either covering it or hanging down around it.

---

[20] See Brooks, p. 40.

[21] Pp. 44-52.

[22] Additional references are found in my *Dramatic Association*, p. 16.

[23] See Brooks, p. 53.

[24] See Brooks, p. 59.

"3. Coffer-shaped sepulchre, generally or always with a cloth or cloths over it.

"4. Coffer or altar surrounded by curtains.

"5. Temporary wooden structure that could be entered.

"6. Chapel with receptacle for cross or Host on or before its altar.

"7. The sepulchre of the present-day exposition rite, usually a tomb-like structure with a recumbent image of Christ, surmounted by a veiled monstrance in which the Host is exposed."

Although Professor Brooks modestly remarks that such a classification "cannot be very definite," I venture my own opinion that this one is highly adequate. That it should entirely supersede that of Professor Bonnell[25] is inevitable from the wider range of evidence upon which it rests. Professor Brooks had at his disposal, for example, large numbers of texts of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio* that were unknown to Professor Bonnell.

After announcing his new classification, Professor Brooks, in separate sections, fully describes each of the seven types of sepulchre, summoning substantial textual evidences, and furnishing three useful photographs. Through the author's generosity, I am able to add a detail to his discussion of the decoration of the sepulchre. From the *Regnum Papisticum* of Thomas Naogeorgus[26] Professor Brooks quotes a passage showing that the sepulchrum was sometimes decorated with flowers.[27] He now very kindly sends me privately the following earlier passage from *Das Weltbuch* (1534) of Sebastian Frank, showing the use of flowers and describing interesting details of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio:*

Am Karfreitag vor Ostern tregt man aber eyn creüt-herumb in eyner procession/leget eyn grosz gestorben menschenz bild in eyn grab/darbei kniet man/brent ser vil liechter/vnd singt darbei tag vn nacht den Psalter mit abgewechseltem Chor/besteckt das grab mit feihel vnnd allerley blumen/opffert darein gelt/eyerfladen etc. bisz disz bild erstehet. . . .Harnach inn der Osternacht bald nach mitnacht/stehet yeder mann vff gen metten/da nimpt man den hültzin bloch oder bild Christi ausz dem grab/erhebet jn vnd tregt in vor yederman her/vnd singen all einhellig/Christ ist erstanden/als dann ist der fasten gen himmel geleüttet. Da isset yeder man was er hat/ (fol. 132^r).

In taking leave of this valuable chapter I venture to emphasize the intimate association between certain types of

---

[25] See Bonnell, pp. 667-682.

[26] Edition of 1553.

[27] See Brooks, p. 69. It may be well to mention Barnabe Googe's English rendering of Naogeorgus's Latin, quoted by H. J. Feasey, *Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial*, London, 1897, pp. 136-137.

sepulchrum and the altar. In view of this association, one may reasonably expect an influence of the altar upon the form of the *sepulchrum*,—more influence perhaps, than Professor Brooks specifically mentions.

For Chapter Eight ("Easter Sepulchres in England") the evidences from liturgico-dramatic sources are slight, since texts of the *Depositio*, *Elevatio*, and *Visitatio* from England are very few. Fortunately, however, generous information is available from such documents as church warden's accounts, church inventories, and mediaeval wills.

Justly pointing to the inaccuracy of the classifications of Wolcott, Feasey, and Bonnell, Professor Brooks proposes a more scholarly division of the Easter sepulchres of England into "two large classes, one the wholly temporary sepulchre and the other the largely temporary one with a permanent architectural base."[28] This classification recognizes the fact that the architectural structures (discussed in Chapter IX) were only part of the *sepulchrum* as actually fitted out for use in the dramatic ceremonials. In the present chapter are considered only the temporary sepulchres, and the temporary features associated with the permanent architectural designs. Into the details of the description I cannot enter; but I pause to quote a passage in which Professor Brooks expresses his opinion as to the special model upon which the English Easter sepulchre was formed:[29]

> There remain, however, the facts that altar and sepulchre had occasionally a canopy of the same type and each had lights and cloths upon or about it; but these are common means of adornment and of showing honor and do not seem to me to be convincing evidence that the sepulchre developed in imitation of the high altar. Certainly the resemblances between sepulchre and altar are not so close and specific as those between sepulchre and hearse, which are pointed out at various places in the course of this chapter. It seems to me that the English Easter sepulchre developed very largely in imitation of the church burial of persons of rank.

This may be accepted as a reasonable conclusion concerning the *temporary, or portable*, sepulchre. The central and essential part was a coffer of wood, and the frame about the coffer resembled a hearse in form, and was sometimes actually called "hearse."[30] Although Professor Brooks may be slightly recalcitrant in his unwillingness to admit influence from the altar,[31] he has, in my opinion, placed the emphasis in the right place.

Chapter Nine ("Permanent Architectural or Sculptural Sepulchres of the Continent and England") closes the monograph proper with a description of the permanent Easter sepulchres of Europe. There are, in the first place, the churches, side chapels, and small independent chapels built in direct imitation of the rotunda over the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. A second group are the sculptural representations in Germany from the late middle ages, describable thus:[32]

---

[28] See Brooks, pp. 72-73.

[29] See Brooks, p. 85.

[30] See Brooks, pp. 75-77.

[31] For further indications that the altar may have influenced the form of the Easter sepulchre see Brooks, p. 89, and Fig. 21.

> The moment usually represented is after the Entombment; the body of Christ lies stretched out on top of a sarcophagus, like the effigy on ordinary chest tombs of that time; behind are the Maries, at each end usually an angel, and in front, generally in relief on the front side of the sarcophagus, the sleeping guards.

The group of Easter sepulchres in England differ from those of Germany in having no image of Christ. The English sepulchre is sometimes a structure solely for dramatic use in Holy Week and on Easter, and sometimes the tomb of a founder, so constructed as to serve also as a *mise en scène* for the dramatic ceremonials.

Though this chapter is short, it treats the subject comprehensively and lucidly, and generously supplies three excellent photographic illustrations (Figures 20, 21, and 22.)

In taking leave of the particulars of this study[33] I wish once more to express my pleasure in Professor Brooks's whole accomplishment. Rarely does a scholar's product so adequately satisfy a recognized need. I venture to say that virtually all students of the church drama have felt themselves impeded, at times, through the absence of a thorough treatise upon the Easter sepulchre. These students will hasten to applaud the monograph that Professor Brooks has now completed with distinction.

Finally, as a former editor of a series conducted in friendly rivalry with the *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, I wish to congratulate Professor Brooks upon his editorial auspices. One of my substantial pleasures in reviewing the present monograph has arisen from its handsome format, its adequate letter-press, and its generous and successful illustrations in photograph.

KARL YOUNG

University of Wisconsin

---

[32] Brooks, p. 88.

[33] I regret that I cannot linger over the new texts of the *Depositio*, *Elevatio*, and *Visitatio* in the Appendix. This rich collection of fresh material from manuscripts and incunabula deserves much more than this casual mention at the end of a review.

A SUBJECT-INDEX TO THE POEMS OF EDMUND SPENSER by Charles Huntington Whitman, Professor of English in Rutgers College. Yale University Press, 1918.

In his *Subject-Index to the Poems of Edmund Spenser*, Professor Charles H. Whitman has brought within the limits of a handbook a very large amount of useful information conveniently arranged for ready reference. The book is a good deal of a concordance, something of a dictionary, and a bit of an encyclopaedia; for one finds among its alphabetically listed items not only words that Spenser uses but such general topical headings as Sports and Pastimes, Agriculture, Church Offices, Astronomy, etc., with cross-references to more specific entries. As Professor Whitman has recognized, it is hard to name a book so variously useful; *Subject-Index* is certainly not satisfactory.

It is to be regretted that Professor Whitman, having gone so far, did not go a step farther and give to his book something of the character of a variorum. Where opinions vary so widely as they do in interpreting Spenser's allegory, the more or less confident interpretations of the better known commentators would have had considerable interest, if only in emphasizing the *tot sententiae*. In his reading of the riddles of the *Fairy Queen* Professor Whitman is usually conservative; but his conservatism has here and there perhaps made him ignore interesting identifications. He retains, for example, the old equation of Satyrane with Sir John Perrot but finds no place for Padelford's opinion that Cranmer, or possibly Latimer, is here figured. On the other hand, while accepting the customary view that Duessa is Mary Queen of Scots, he says nothing of the time-honored identification of Orgoglio with Philip II. A good many other cases of omissions might of course be cited to show that the compiler made a loose application of his principle that allegorical interpretations should be admitted whenever he found "sufficient evidence to support them." Where, as in the case of Sir Calidore and Mirabella, two identifications are given, it would have been well to cite authorities.

If it is not captious to criticise further so useful a book as the *Subject-Index*, one might express a regret that Professor Whitman takes no account of the small body of Spenser's prose. Accordingly, the *Index* contains no mention of the *Areopagus*, and under Rosalind there are no references to the Harvey-Spenser correspondence. The limitation that the compiler has set upon his book justifies him in omitting references to the *View* under the heading Lord Grey, but there can be no excuse for failing to refer to the dedicatory sonnet to *Virgil's Gnat* under the Earl of Leicester.

H. S. V. Jones

THE SATIRE OF JOHN MARSTON. By Morse S. Allen. Princeton Ph.D. Dissertation. Columbus, Ohio. 1920.

Dr. Allen's dissertation is a careful summary and revaluation of all the problems which concern Marston as a satirist. It begins with the two quarrels with Hall and Jonson, passes on to an analysis of the verse satires, *Pygmalion's Image* and *Scourge of Villainy*, and concludes with a summary of the satiric elements in the plays. The principle of Dr. Allen's work is prudence; he has no radical theories to present, and gives short shrift to the guesses of previous scholars. The result is a study of Marston that is eminently safe.

In crossing swords with Hall, Dr. Allen believes that Marston was moved not by any contemptuous references to himself, but by Hall's strictures on contemporary poets. He does not think that Hall ever replied to Marston, or took any notice of him, except possibly in the epigram which Hall is credited with having had pasted in every copy of *Pygmalion* which came to Cambridge.

Accepting Jonson's statement to Drummond that his quarrel with Marston arose out of Marston's representing him on the stage, Dr. Allen finds that origin in the character of Chrisoganus in *Histriomastix*. This he feels convinced was a satire on Jonson, and he is equally sure of Lampatho in *What You Will*. His reasons in both cases have a good deal of force; not so strongly supported is his argument that in Brabant Senior, the unsympathetic railler of *Jack Drum*, Marston was again aiming at Jonson, not so much at his person as at his habits of mind. To quote Dr. Allen's own words: "What he did was to rebuke Jonson for a characteristic of his dramas, and incidentally satirize his arrogance, and his disdain for contemporary literature."[1] As to Jonson's representations of Marston, Dr. Allen will accept only Crispinus of the *Poetaster* as certain. Otherwise he detects only occasional fleers at Marston's style. Thus he will not agree that either Hedon or Anaides of *Cynthia's Revels* is a portrait of Marston. And he protests against the habit of reading personal satire into the plays involved, or supposed to be involved, in the controversy. His basic premise is that "it was only the exceptional Elizabethan play which contained any personal satire."[2] Accordingly it is in this light that he interprets Jonson, a man by the way who saw everything in a very personal light. "His Brisks and Hedons represent a general type much more than they do any particular individual."[3] This is as near to a bias as Dr. Allen comes, and surely he could not have a safer bias.

---

[1] P. 37.
[2] P. 39.
[3] P. 21.

His treatment of the stage quarrel, therefore, is much simpler than most others, as is gauged by the fact that he will admit of only seven plays as having been in any way concerned. These are *Histriomastix, Every Man out of his Humour, Jack Drum's Entertainment, Cynthia's Revels, What You Will, Poetaster*, and *Satiromastix*.

Dr. Allen's treatment of the literary aspects of Marston's satire is in the nature of analysis rather than argument, and calls for little comment. He finds a dualism in Marston's personality comprised of a genuine distaste for corruption and desire to reform, on the one hand, and on the other a strong curiosity as to vice. "At the bottom Marston was indignant at the world, and contemptuous of it; he had something of what Swinburne apostrophized as his 'noble heart of hatred.' . . . Taking this wider outlook, I feel sure that Marston regarded himself as being like his own Malcontent or Fawn, in the world but not of it."[4] At the same time, "when lust is so carefully and lingeringly dwelt upon, it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that its consideration was pleasing to the author."[5] Dr. Allen finds a parallel in Dean Swift, who in other respects seems to him to echo Marston's personality, especially in the intellectual, non-emotional character of his filth.

The satire of Marston disintegrates, we are told, in the later plays. At first, "Marston had possessed the younger, more hopeful mood where satire is administered to reform vice. Now it sours into something very close to hatred for the world as a whole. He certainly despises man."[6] This disintegration, begun in *What You Will*, culminates in the *Fawn*, where the satire is base and nauseous. The *Fawn* also represents the breaking up of the Malcontent type, with which Marston himself was becoming disgusted. The last plays, *Sophonisba* and the *Insatiate Countess*, are crude attempts to recapture the doubtful glories of the *Antonio* plays. Dr. Allen concludes his survey by wondering whether Marston would not have been happier in the age of the novel; "had his gifts for satire, depiction of real life, and vivid characterization, been employed in the looser form of the novel, it is possible that his name would bulk much larger than it does in literary history."[7] To which one might reply that inasmuch as Marston's genius was of the stage stagey, it is doubtful if it would have thriven better elsewhere.

HAROLD N. HILLEBRAND

University of Illinois

---

[4] P. 119.

[5] P. 97.

[6] P. 159.

[7] P. 161.

THE FORMATION OF TENNYSON'S STYLE: A Study, Primarily, of the Versification of the Early Poems, by **J. F. A. Pyre** (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 12). Madison, 1921.

Professor Pyre has undertaken the sort of evaluation of Tennyson's works which is suggested by the sub-title of his monograph. He has adjudicated the relative importance of Tennyson's poems by examining their prosody. This metrical examination has enabled him to arrange Tennyson's work in three chronological groups. There is in his youth the period of exuberant experimentation with a variety of complex stanza forms. Out of this groping for the forms best adapted to express his personality, developed the mature work of the 1842 volume. In this volume the prevailing forms were blank verse and the four stress or the four and three stress iambic quatrain, both of which were employed with skilful but limited modulations. The final period, if we except *In Memoriam*, was one of decadence, in which the security of the laureateship or of popular applause insidiously promoted a revolt from the standard that had been attained and a return to the freedom and the experimentation of his early years. This general view is not new. So far as prosody is concerned, it is implied in Saintsbury's chapter on Tennyson in his *History of Nineteenth Century Literature*. It is the view of those men, like Fitzgerald, who in his own day or since have been attracted chiefly by the melody of Tennyson's verse.

Professor Pyre's method of substantiating his thesis is as familiar as the thesis itself. This method, which was first given its scholarly basis in Robert Bridge's treatise on *Milton's Prosody*, assumes that English verse is primarily accentual rather than quantitive or syllabic in its nature. Once this position is taken, if English metrics are to be properly understood, an inquiry must follow into the relation between stresses. This inquiry implies a more thoro investigation than would be necessary in French or Latin into the nature and frequency of the mediums that may be used to break or modify the regularity of stress recurrence. In the hands of most commentators, including the present one, the inquiry becomes an intricate statistical analysis of inversions, cesuras, final feet, extra syllabic lines, and so on.

Applied to Tennyson, this prosodic method reveals the poet's attainment at his maturity to a comparatively simple norm in line and stanza, as the following summary shows.

In the 1830 volume there are scarcely two poems in the same meter. The irregularity of the stanza forms is shown most apparently by the fact that even in the few sonnets included the normal structure is violated. The best poems according to

Professor Pyre are those that are most regular; and of these *Mariana* is noteworthy, for the last four lines of this stanza, when detached, become the form later used for *In Memoriam*. The 1833 volume is marked by similar variety, but shows a tendency to retain the same stanza form without modification during a whole poem. In the 1842 volume the norm has been attained. Many of the poems of this volume are thoro rewritings of poems in the 1833 issue. Professor Pyre gives us once more the familar analysis of the differences in the structure of *A Dream of Fair Women* and *The Palace of Art* (p. 50) in the two editions. There are thirty-six new poems, besides, in this volume. Of these, two are ballads, two anapestic, two trochaic, two iambic in meter; but nine are in blank verse and eighteen in four stress or four and three stress quatrains. Herein then lies the norm, which Professor Pyre believes Tennyson worked out for himself without external aid. This normal poem is short, slow of movement, regular of stress. The foot is prevailingly iambic, seldom trochaic. The diction is simplified and chary of polysyllables. There is a moderate use of beginning and cesural inversions. There is an avoidance of weak syllables at the stress and at the verse end. There are few double endings and few cesuras; in other words, there are few extra syllables and predominantly masculine pauses within the line. A moderate use of spondees aids in the production of a slow line by strengthening the unstressed syllables (p. 115). Professor Pyre gives accurate statistical verification for these generalizations. This norm is somewhat relaxed in the *Morte d'Arthur*, which Professor Pyre agrees with Fitzgerald in believing Tennyson's finest poem (p. 139). But here there is a compensation. "Freedom of syllabing and stress modulation, then, are skilfully balanced by careful maintenance of the verse unit and regularity in the disposition of pause" (p. 147).

After the 1842 volume, with the exception of *In Memoriam*, Tennyson issued nothing of comparable merit. *In Memoriam* meets with Professor Pyre's approval because, being a series of short poems in a simple meter, it affords adequate opportunity for Tennyson's prevailingly lyric gift to express itself. Its verse form, tho used by certain previous poets (Jonson, Sidney, etc.), was evolved independently, and is skilfully modulated. The pauses come generally at the end of the first line and towards the end of the third, so that the central couplet is not over-emphasized and is connected in sense with the concluding line (p. 186). In the rest of the later poems, degeneracy is evidenced as a result of the demand for fluency in the long narrative poems which enticed Tennyson at this period. This fluency, which the dramatic character of the later work demanded, Professor Pyre does not justify, for he has little respect for Tennyson as a narrative poet. *The Princess* is a *tour de force* of uncertain interpretation in which only the songs are good. The proof rests on the fact that out of each one hundred lines 20.16 per cent have extra syllables; whereas in the 1842 volume the percentage was 5.8. In the *Idylls*, except for those written in the earlier period, there are many licenses taken to secure a dramatic realism and an ease of flow. The list is impressive, and includes counter cesural inversions, weak measures, epic cesuras, double endings, final tribrachs, weak feminine endings (p. 205). Indeed Tennyson himself is censured for saying that he wrote the poems with ease and little correction, and for admitting that he varied the verse to suit the changing character of the theme. Finally in his last work, Tennyson shows a tendency to revert to his youthful practice of experimentation; only now the experimentation is not in historical English forms but in classical meters. When he is not writing these interesting studies, which are nevertheless not poems, he betrays his histrionic tendency by writing dramas. This unnatural absorption in the dramatic, which Professor Pyre suggests may have been partly due to the influence of Browning (p. 153, 163, 190), is seen most conspicuously in the morbid impetuosity of *Maud*. If a norm is to be looked for in this period, it is to be found in a delight in three stress and six stress verse units and irregular and trochaic or dactylic rhythms (p. 222: note p. 209).

Professor Pyre's monograph concludes with two interesting appendices. The second establishes a probability that Tennyson, and not Browning, originated the *Locksley Hall* meter. The first consists of an analysis of the diction of the early poems. The result of this analysis is a correction of the views of J. C. Collins (*Tennyson's Early Poems*, London, 1900), who had emphasized the influence upon Tennyson of his immediate predecessors. After a comparative study of his diction, Professor Pyre concludes that Tennyson was under greater influence from Milton and Shakespeare in his formative years than from Shelley, Keats, and Coleridge. The influence of Coleridge is negligible. That of Shelley is found in those passages in which Shelley himself has been indebted to Milton. The early and very transient influence of Byron is similar to that of Shelley in character (p.74).

The above outline is sufficient to show that Professor Pyre has done a service in proving by a painstaking statistical analysis what has often been said of Tennyson: that by a careful apprenticeship and a constant rewriting, Tennyson had succeeded by 1842 in bringing his exuberance of descriptive powers under control and in establishing comparatively simple verse forms which he modulated in less obvious ways than previously. But unfortunately Professor Pyre has not limited himself to this service alone. He has allowed much purely literary material to creep into a monograph that begins as a technical treatise. When he gets to the period after 1842, which he calls decadent because the normal verse forms he has set up for Tennyson are being discarded or loosely used, he gives only cursory summaries of his technical material and supplements such statements with literary speculations which he does not support with any detailed reasoning. The critic would not feel forced to object to this broadening of the scope of the work simply because it leads to a superficiality of treatment. He must object also to the critical point of view which Professor Pyre assumes to justify it. Professor Pyre is still a Pre-Raphaelite, and believes a poem to consist of a pattern of musical words built out of some inconspicuous abstraction. Even in this present day, when there are many iconoclasts who find Tennyson insipid and effeminate, Professor Pyre may be pardoned for his several references to the finality and perfection of Tennyson's poetry at its best (pp. 50, 148, 156-60). But there are few to-day who will not find objectionable the almost complete disregard of sense in favor of sound which is inevitable in a treatise that attempts a half esthetic, half technical analysis of metrics.

The reader does not have to hunt in the dark for proof of Professor Pyre's preference for form instead of content. In his criticism of *The Princess* Professor Pyre states by inference his critical canon: "It is quite plain that the theme and the stuff of his poetry came to occupy him somewhat to the exclusion of its architectonics, its technical detail, and its atmosphere. By 1869, he who once bade fair to be a very king among the Pre-Raphaelites was in a mood to hail 'Art for Art's sake' as 'truest Lord of Hell.' " (p. 164). Professor Pyre, who admires Tennyson only when he is a lyric poet, finds no compensation for what he considers faulty meter in the philosophy of such works as *Vastness*, *De Profundis*, and *The Higher Pantheism*, or in such characterizations as those of Launcelot and Guinevere, of Lucretius and Virgil. Blind to these aspects of the poet, the author of the treatise before us is not unwilling to pluck from *The Ancient Sage* such lyrical insipidities as the following stanza to illustrate a surviving beauty in a period of decay (p. 220):—

> The years that when my youth began
> Had set the lily and rose
> By all my ways, where'er they ran,
> Have ended mortal foes;
> My rose of love forever gone,
> My lily of truth and trust,
> They made her lily and rose in one
> And changed her into dust.

Such a critical method, arising from a supposedly scholarly treatment of metrics, the reviewer would find himself inclined to decry, if it were not so palpably a mid-Victorian survival. Shorn of its esthetic criticism, Professor Pyre's work retains a certain value for students of English prosody. But those readers who desire a sound critical survey of Tennyson's earlier years, of which a study of verse structure forms a subordinate element, had best confine themselves to Lounsbury's *Life and Times of Tennyson (1809–1850)*.

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM

University of Illinois

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

European Agent of the Journal of English and Germanic Philology

ADOLF WEIGEL

NEW AND SECONDHAND BOOKSELLER

LEIPZIG, GERMANY, WINTERGARTENSTR. 4, I

ADOLF
WEIGEL
Buchhandlung und Antiquariat
LEIPZIG
Wintergartenstr. 4

Important and Choicest Stock of Rare and Illustrated German, English, and French Books, Standard Works, Library Sets and Periodicals of all kinds.

PUBLISHER OF THE MONUMENTAL ENCYCLOPAEDIA

"Die Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie"

The German Dictionary of National Biography

26,300 Biographies, 1850 Collaborators of great reputation

BARGAIN

"DIE ALLGEMEINE DEUTSCHE BIOGRAPHIE" herausgegeben durch die historische Kommission bei der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften (Founded by Leopold von Ranke and J. von Döllinger; edited under the protectorate of the Royal Academy at Munich by Rochus von Liliencron). *55 volumes and 1 vol. containing the index = 56 volumes*, Leipzig, 1875 to 1912.
Bound in fine new half-calf binding, gilt back.

Now offered for only 4,000 Marks—equal to about $70

This Standard Work contains a complete biography of every prominent German, distinguished in Literature, Science, Art, Commerce and Industry, or any other sphere of activity in public life. This work is now complete.
This set should not be missing from any Library, not even the smaller ones, from seminars and and private libraries, as it is *an indispensable aid to scientific research of any kind.*

ORDERS TO BE ADDRESSED TO

ADOLF WEIGEL

LEIPZIG WINTERGARTENSTRASSE 4

A. MARCUS & E. WEBERS VERLAG
in Bonn

Shakespeare Quellen in der Originalsprache und deutsch

herausgegeben im Auftrag der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft.

Soeben ist erschienen:

2. BÄNDCHEN

Romeo und Julia

herausgegeben
von
Rudolf Fischer

Inhalt:

I. Masuccio's Mariotto und Gianozza
II. Da Porto's Giulietta
III. Bandello's Romeo und Gulietta
IV. Boisteau's Rhomeo und Juliette
V. Brooke's Romeus und Juliet

Preis für das Ausland auf der Grundlage von 3 **Goldmark**

Früher schien:

1. BÄNDCHEN

König Lear

Inhalt:

I. Galfrids Geschichte der Briten
II. Holinsheds Chronik
III. Der Spiegel der Obrigkeiten
IV. Spenser's Feenkönigin
V. Das Chronikendrama von König Leir
VI. Sidneys Arkadia

Preis für das Ausland auf der Grundlage von 2 **Goldmark**

THREE SERIES OF MONOGRAPHS

Three series of monographs are published by the University of Illinois, as indicated below. Each series is published quarterly. The total number of pages in a volume of four numbers is about 600, but the size of the individual numbers varies considerably. $3.00 a year for each series.

STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Financial History of Ohio, by E. L. Bogart ($1.80).
The History of the General Property Tax in Illinois, by R. M. Haig ($1.25).
Church and State in Massachusetts, 1691–1740, by Susan M. Reed ($1.05).
Friedrich Gentz: an opponent of the French Revolution and Napoleon, by P. F. Reiff ($0.80).
Taxation of corporations in Illinois other than railroads, since 1872, by J. R. Moore ($0.55).
The West in the diplomacy of the American Revolution, by P. C. Phillips ($1.25).
The Illinois Whigs before 1846, by C. M. Thompson ($0.95).
The Enforcement of International Law through Municipal Law in the United States, by P. Q. Wright ($1.25).
History of the Illinois Central Railroad to 1870, by H. G. Brownson ($1.25).
The Life of Jesse W. Fell, by Frances M. Morehouse ($0.60).
Land tenure in the United States, with special reference to Illinois, by C. L. Stewart ($0.75).
Mine Taxation in the United States, by L. E. Young ($1.50).
The Veto Power of the Governor of Illinois, by N. H. Debel ($1.00).
Wage Bargaining on the Vessels of the Great Lakes, by H. E. Hoagland ($1.50).
The Household of a Tudor Nobleman, by P. V. B. Jones ($1.50).
Financial regulation of railways in England, by C. C. Wang ($1.50).
The American Municipal Executive, by R. M. Story ($1.25).
The Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, by C. J. Stowell ($1.00).
Cumulative Voting and Minority Representation in Illinois. By B. F. Moore ($0.75).
Labor Problems and Labor Administration in the United States During the World War, by G. S. Watkins ($2.00).

ILLINOIS BIOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS

A Revision of the Cestode Family Proteocephalidae, by G. R. LaRue ($2.00).
Studies on the Cestode Family Anoplocephalidae, by H. Douthitt ($0.80).
Larval Trematodes from North American Fresh-Water Snails, by W. W. Cort ($1.20).
The Classification of Lepidopterous Larvae, by S. B. Fracker ($1.50).
On the Osteology of Some of the Loricati, by J. E. Gutberlet ($0.50).
Studies in the Gregarines, including Twenty-one New Species and a synopsis of the Eugregarine Records, by Minnie E. Watson ($2.00).
The genus Meliola in Porto Rico, by F. L. Stevens ($0.75).
Studies of the factors controlling regeneration, by Charles Zeleny ($1.25).
The head-capsule and mouth-parts of Diptera, by Alvah Peterson ($2.00).
Studies on North American Polystomidae, Aspidogastridae, and Paramphistomidae, by H. W. Stunkard ($1.25).
Color and Color-Pattern Mechanism of Tiger Beetles, by V. E. Shelford ($2.00).
Life History of Montana Trematodes, by E. C. Faust ($2.00).
The Goldfish (Carassius carassius) as a test animal in the study of toxicity, by Edwin B. Powers ($1.00).
Morphology and biology of some Turbellaria from the Mississippi Basin, by Ruth Higley ($1.25).
North American Pseudophyllidean Cestodes from Fishes. By A. R. Cooper ($2.00).
The Skull of Amiurus. By J. E. Kindred ($1.25).
Contributions to the Life Histories of Gordius robustus *Leidy and* Paragordius varius *(Leidy).* By H. G. May ($1.50).
Studies on Myxosporidia. By R. Kudo ($3.00).
The Nasal Organ in Amphibia. By G. M. Higgins ($1.00).
Revision of the North American and West Indian Species of Cuscuta. By T. G. Yuncker.
The Larvae of the Coccinellidae. By J. H. Gage.

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

The Phonology of the Dialect of Aurland, Norway, by G. T. Flom ($1.25).
Studies in the Milton Tradition, by J. W. Good ($1.75).
Thomas Warton, by Clarissa Rinaker ($1.00).
Illustrations from Mediaeval Romance on Tiles from Chertsey Abbey, by R. S. Loomis ($0.75).
Joseph Ritson: a critical biography, by H. A. Burd ($1.15).
Miscellanea Hibernica, by Kuno Meyer ($1.00).
The Ad Deum Vadit *of Jean Gerson*, by D. H. Carnahan ($1.75).
Tagalog Texts, Part I, Texts and translation, by Leonard Bloomfield ($1.50).
Tagalog Texts, Part II, Grammatical analysis, by Leonard Bloomfield ($3.00).
Tagalog Texts, Part III, List of formations and glossary, by Leonard Bloomfield ($1.50).
Madame de Staël's Literary Reputation in England, by R. C. Whitford ($0.75).
Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur. By W. A. Oldfather, A. S. Pease, and H. V. Canter ($5.00).
Influence of Christianity on the Vocabulary of Old English Poetry. By Albert Keiser ($1.50).
Spenser's Defense of Lord Grey. By H. S. V. Jones ($1.00).
Ysopet-Avionnet: The Latin and French Texts. By K. McKenzie and W. A. Oldfather ($1.50).
La Colección Cervantina de la Sociedad Hispánica de America. By Homero Serís ($1.50).
Order from H. E. Cunningham, 161 Administration Bldg., Urbana, Illinois.

Publications of the University of Illinois

Following is a partial list of the publications issued at the University:

1. The Journal of English and Germanic Philology. Published quarterly. Three dollars a year.

2. The University Studies. A series of monographs on miscellaneous subjects.

3. The University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences is a special series. Monographs in history, economics, political science, and sociology, issued quarterly. Three dollars a year. See titles within.

4. The Illinois Biological Monographs, published quarterly. Three dollars a year. See titles within.

5. The University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, published quarterly. Three dollars a year. See titles within.

For any of the above, address 161 Administration Building, University of Illinois.

6. The Bulletin of the Agricultural Experiment Station. Address Director Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Illinois.

7. The Bulletin of the Engineering Experiment Station. A report of the research work in the Engineering Experiment Station. Address Director of Engineering Experiment Station, University of Illinois.

8. The Bulletin of the State Laboratory of Natural History. Address Director of State Laboratory of Natural History, University of Illinois.

9. The Bulletin of the State Geological Survey. Address Director of State Geological Survey, University of Illinois.

10. The Bulletin of the State Water Survey. Address Director of State Water Survey, University of Illinois.

11. The Report of the State Entomologist. Address State Entomologist, University of Illinois.

12. The Bulletin of the Illinois Association of Teachers of English. Address 301 University Hall, University of Illinois.

13. The Bulletin of the School of Education. Address 203 University Hall, University of Illinois.

14. The Law Bulletin. Address 207 Law Building, University of Illinois.

15. The general series, containing the University catalog and circulars of special departments. Address the Registrar, University of Illinois.